

THE LONDON QUARTERLY & HOLBORN REVIEW

BL
*P

Edited by J. Alan Kay, M.A., Ph.D.

JULY 1956

Contributors Include

SPIRITUAL HEALING

JOHN CROWLESMITH
ERASTUS EVANS, M.A.
P. H. W. GRUBB, M.A.
J. BURNETT RAE, M.B., CH.B.
H. C. ROBINS, M.A.
E. S. WATERHOUSE, M.A., D.D., D.LIT.

G. THOMPSON BRAKE
FRANK CALLISTER, M.A., B.D.
A. G. CURNOW
TOM DRING
K. VAUGHAN JONES, M.A., B.D.
M. R. LANE, B.SC., D.PHIL.
C. RYDER SMITH, B.A., D.D.
CHARLES H. S. WARD

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

JUL 5 1956

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM



THE EPWORTH PRESS
[FRANK H. CUMBERS]
25-35 CITY ROAD LONDON EC1

Four Shillings Net

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW

is published on 25th March, June, September and December. All contributions (typewritten, if possible) should be sent to the Editor, 25-35, City Road, London, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope.

Contents

Editorial Comments by J. Alan Kay, M.A., PH.D.	161	The Christian Doctrine of Redemption and Education Today by G. Thompson Brake	202
The New Testament Teaching by E. S. Waterhouse, M.A., D.D., D.LIT.	165	Popular Song Theology by K. Vaughan Jones, M.A., B.D.	208
Spiritual Healing in the History of the Church by H. C. Robins, M.A.	170	The Influence of Presupposition on Conviction By A. G. Curnow	213
Spiritual Healing in the Methodist Church by John Crowlesmith	175	Common Sense, Science, and Religion by Frank Callister, M.A., B.D.	218
Spiritual Healing —As a Doctor Sees It by J. Burnett Rae	179	The Family of God by Tom Dring	223
Healing Through Meditation by P. H. W. Grubb, M.A.	186	The Language of Faith by M. R. LANE, B.SC., D.PHIL.	227
Intercession and Healing by Erastus Evans, M.A.	190	Recent Literature Edited by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.	230
Gotama Buddha by Charles H. S. Ward	196	From My New Shelf by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.	237
		Our Contributors	240

A Vocation for Women

Founded by Dr Stephenson, the Sisterhood Order of the National Children's Home has steadily grown in numbers and effectiveness. It is being regularly recruited by women candidates between the ages of twenty and forty with an aptitude for work amongst children, and ready to take the necessary training for the varied and responsible task of bringing up a family of other people's boys and girls.

The Principal is always glad to hear of suitable entrants for the Sisterhood. Any who wish to take up this form of service should write to him at the address below giving particulars of age, education and experience.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME

Chief Office: Highbury Park, London, N.5

Editorial Comments

SPIRITUAL HEALING

ONE OF THE welcome facts of our day is the increasing recognition that the realms of nature and spirit are not mutually exclusive, that spirit works through matter and matter influences spirit, that Christianity is genuinely incarnational, and that the kingdoms of nature and of grace are both a part of the Kingdom of God. This is seen in a new concern about the sacraments, a new interest in various kinds of religious art, a new understanding of the part played by the mental and physical experiences of childhood upon the growth of the spirit, a new sense of the unity of science and religion, a new understanding of the use of symbols in worship, and increased respect for the effect of material and social conditions upon the soul; we see more clearly than our immediate forefathers that the Creator and the Saviour are one God. Yet another aspect of this new understanding is the concern that is shown about spiritual healing, and our readers will find stimulus in the various articles upon that subject which appear in this present issue.

Since the articles were written, and indeed since they were set up in type, the British Medical Association has published its report on *Divine Healing and Co-operation between Doctors and Clergy*. The Association received a request in January 1954 from the Archbishops' Commission on Divine Healing asking, not only what suggestions it could make about the co-operation of doctors and clergy, but what evidence it could submit, in connexion with divine healing, of cures, accelerated recovery from illness, the medical value of prayer and healing services, etc., and the circumstances in which such practices are valuable or harmful.

It is interesting to find this committee of doctors confirming many of the things which various committees of the Church have said before them. They agree that in a sense all healing may be considered to be Divine. They say very strongly that physical health depends on more than physical agents. They point out that the course of an illness can be very unfavourably affected if patients are led to think they will be cured by spiritual means and the cure does not take place, especially if the lack of cure is put down to their lack of faith. And they are agreed that a sufferer may respond emotionally to some methods of divine healing and appear to improve physically only to find later that his complaint is still progressing, and that when this happens the task of both doctor and priest is made more difficult and the faith of both the patient and his family may be shattered.

Three of their conclusions are worthy of special notice here. First, they agree that 'Many individuals said to be "cured" by non-medical methods of treatment would appear to be suffering from psychogenic disorders, including psychosomatic states in which physical symptoms result from emotional disturbances—such as "nervous headache due to worry," or "nervous" indigestion

due to anxiety or unrecognized resentment', and that disorders of psychological origin may be cured by the methods of spiritual healing, but also by many other methods of treatment.

The implication is that there is nothing unique in the curative powers of spiritual healing in this sort of case. We cannot but feel, however, that in some of these cases it is only by the power of God that the patient can surmount his worry or cast off his anxiety or overcome his resentment or, we may add, receive a sense of sins forgiven, and that in such cases spiritual factors are therefore necessary for his healing and irreplaceable by any others.

Secondly, they say: 'we can find no evidence that there is any type of illness cured by "spiritual healing" alone which could not have been cured by medical treatment'. There appears to be no significance here in the use of the word 'types', for they go on to say; 'we can find no evidence that organic diseases are cured solely by such means' [i.e. by 'various methods of spiritual healing']. Evidently what they really mean is that they cannot find even a single case where it is certain that an organic disease which could not have been cured by medical treatment has been cured solely by spiritual healing.

This may sound, from the Christian's point of view, a disappointing conclusion, but it is not a surprising one. The committee, quite rightly, have to allow for a number of alternative explanations of the cases which have been brought before their notice. It is possible that there was a mistake in diagnosis; a case diagnosed as epilepsy, for example, may really have been one of hysteria. It is possible that there was a mistake in prognosis; it is never possible for a doctor to foretell with certainty what is going to happen to any one particular patient, for a certain proportion of patients unexpectedly recover in any case, apart altogether from spiritual healing, and an unexpected survival in a case where spiritual healing has been practised may therefore be due to chance. It is possible that the alleviation of symptoms was mistaken for cure; it is quite possible for the pain of rheumatoid arthritis to be abolished by spiritual healing, and for the patient to be enabled to walk, without the inflammatory condition being cured. It is possible that the disease was one subject to remissions; in some diseases it is normal for the symptoms to disappear for a time, and for the patient to appear to recover, but for the illness to return later and for the patient to suffer a relapse. It is possible that the cure was a spontaneous one; medical men not infrequently meet with illness which, as far as previous experience goes, should prove fatal, but which appears to resolve unexpectedly, and there are reports, for example, of cancers behaving in this way. It is possible that a patient was treated both by the methods of spiritual healing and those prescribed by a doctor, and it is not then possible to say that one of these methods alone has been responsible for the cure.

The committee not unexpectedly say that 'When all these possibilities are considered it leaves little room for miraculous cures of organic disease by the methods of spiritual healing'. When they go on to add that in this country unexpected cures which cannot be explained are very few, and that 'in the few cases that might be looked on as "miracles" one would need to know whether to attribute them to the intervention of a supernatural Power or to the action of natural laws as yet undiscovered' (p. 19), it is not surprising that they find no evidence of miraculous cures at all.

Thirdly, the committee say that there is considerable evidence of the value of religious ministration in the treatment of illness, and they speak of the valuable medical results of religious conversion, belief in divine help, trust in God, and an atmosphere of real love and sympathy; but they add that 'From the illustrations given by correspondents and from oral evidence the Committee was unable to obtain any convincing examples of rapid or accelerated recovery from serious illnesses', though they agree that 'so-called "functional" disorders do sometimes appear to yield to spiritual ministrations'. This would seem to be contradictory; it amounts to saying that religion is of great value in the treatment of illness, though it does not help the patient to recover any more quickly. But if the patient does not recover any more quickly with religious help than without it, of what value, from the medical point of view, has it been?

Probably what the committee mean is that there is no certain and incontrovertible proof. 'In nearly every case', they say (apparently admitting that there are exceptions, but unfortunately not enumerating them or allowing for them in their conclusions), 'there is also a medical explanation or there has been concurrently some medical treatment or other factor which might well account for the improvement or recovery.' There are, however, many cases given in Appendix II, which may fall short of incontrovertible proof, but which are impressive nevertheless. It is clear that there are many cases of accelerated recovery which *may* be explained by other factors but which the doctors concerned in them unhesitatingly attribute to the result of some form of divine healing.

It is clear that an investigation of the kind undertaken by this committee of the B.M.A. is faced with extraordinary difficulties. First there is that of collecting the necessary evidence. We cannot help feeling that although the committee did its best to secure the evidence that was requested, it did not receive all the co-operation that could have been desired. Time and again there are statements that evidence has not been provided where one might reasonably have expected it to exist. The results of the questionnaire which was printed in the *British Medical Journal* are said to be 'meagre', and the committee adds that 'this seemed to show that doctors lacked knowledge and experience of Divine healing or were uninterested in the subject'. The *British Medical Journal* statement which accompanied the questionnaire asked that full details of cases should be given, but 'with one exception, the evidence submitted was uncritical'. To take another point, 'little precise information was received about the danger of delay in seeking medical attention through reliance on spiritual ministrations', though from the number of cases that many of us come across by accident, it is fairly certain that a good deal of evidence of this kind exists. Yet again, 'information concerning active co-operation between doctors and clergy was difficult to obtain'; the committee thought that co-operation between individuals is 'fairly common', but found that 'direct evidence of its nature is scanty'.

The committee complained, too, of another difficulty: 'The bulk of the replies were from believers in Divine healing.' That is not surprising; after all, if a doctor does not believe in the possibility of divine healing, he will not be inclined to take the trouble to fill in a questionnaire which asks for evidence of its efficacy. The committee felt, however, that this was unsatisfactory, and they warn their readers that 'It must be borne in mind that the majority of the doctors

who replied believe in prayer and so were naturally prejudiced in its favour'. It should of course be added that doctors who do not believe in prayer will be just as much prejudiced as those who do; but that only emphasizes the fact that those who give evidence will inevitably be prejudiced in one way or the other.

A third difficulty is that the only people who can give satisfactory evidence on the subject of healing are the doctors, and therefore any Committee of investigation must quite rightly restrict its inquiries on that subject to members of the medical profession. But doctors do not attend to their patients without giving them some kind of treatment and advice, however little, and therefore every case that is investigated will have been treated in two ways, medical and spiritual. In such circumstances it is impossible to say that the patient's recovery has been due *solely* to spiritual healing.

But the greatest difficulty, of course, is that it is always possible to say that recovery must have been due to some other cause—either to one that is known to have operated in other cases, or to 'the action of natural laws as yet undiscovered', or to 'the chancy, unpredictable factor which is always bursting in and upsetting all our calculations about living creatures' (p. 19). It might be thought that an accumulation of instances of survival after the practice of divine healing would provide evidence that was convincing enough, but survivals take place without divine healing, and deaths take place with it, and the only way to assess its claims would be to work on a quantitative basis and to accompany the experiments by adequate controls. It is obvious, however, that one cannot experiment with divine healing as one can with a drug, and therefore there seems to be no prospect of being able to produce incontrovertible proof of its efficacy. Divine healing is a matter which is comparable with answers to prayer in general, and indeed with the existence of God: it is not open to the ordinary methods of scientific proof. But that does not mean that it is not a reality. We believe not only in its existence but in its importance, and expect that the Church will learn yet more of its secrets and make available yet more of its power.

THE NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING

APART FROM the passage in the Epistle of James, there is little direct teaching upon spiritual healing in the New Testament. But there is not a little that can be indirectly gathered. First and foremost there is the record of the healing work of Jesus. No part of His work is more authenticated than this, and all four Gospels agree in recording it. The Fourth Gospel, ignoring the Synoptic traditions of miracles, substitutes certain healings which are not recorded by the other Gospels—namely, those of the man at the Pool of Bethesda, the man born blind, and the nobleman's son. There seems no real case for identifying the second of these with the account in Matthew 9^a, of the healing of two blind men. There is more similarity between the last and the Synoptic story of the healing of the centurion's servant, but, even so, the dissimilarities are more than the similarities. The reason for the paucity of healing miracles in the Fourth Gospel may be that the writer's interest in them was as 'signs' that helped to give authority to the teaching, rather than in themselves. Whilst, therefore, the healing work of Jesus is known pre-eminently through the Synoptic tradition, it is added to, not denied by, what the Fourth Gospel records.

The extreme school which would expunge all miracles from the New Testament ends with a very emasculated gospel. The shallow generalization that a miracle tradition gathers round all great figures, especially those who lived in uncritical times, is open to many exceptions. John the Baptist did no miracles, and although many miracles are attributed to Elijah and Elisha, not many are ascribed to other prophets. There is, of course, the very homely remedy of a plaster of figs applied to the boil upon Hezekiah by Isaiah; that indeed was in itself no miracle, but it is associated with the story of the shadow on the sundial, which, however, the sceptical explain by the principle of relativity—that moving the sundial gives the same effect as moving back the sun, and is much easier! But nobody looks to Amos or Jeremiah or the later prophets for miracles. In short, apart from the tradition handed down in the Elijah-Elisha saga, the greatest of Israel's famous men, the prophets, have very little that is miraculous attributed to them. So much, then, for the attempts to dismiss the miracle stories of the New Testament as the usual fringe which hangs from the robes of greatness.

That Jesus should perform for the sick what no other man has done is not surprising, when we remember that in every other respect Jesus is also unique. The Carpenter's Son from remote Galilee, whose ministry was so pathetically brief, was executed as a criminal. He left behind Him a handful of frightened men, Galilean fishermen, a tax-collector, and a few others, of no special influence or education. They fled and forsook Him, yet in a few brief weeks they suddenly burst out with an amazing message to an astounded Israel. They laughed at persecution and even death. They attracted to them a stiff young Pharisee, who, after persecuting them, fell under the spell of Jesus and preached Him to the Gentiles, founding little communities which grew snowball fashion, after their leader Paul had also given his life for his faith.

The Roman world was at first amused, then annoyed, then angry, and fell upon the humble folk, not many mighty, not many noble, the weak and base

things of the world, but in vain. In Glover's words, these slaves, peasants, shopkeepers 'outlived, out-thought and out-died' the pagan world, and some 300 years only from Calvary, Constantine bowed to the faith. History knows no such other story. If Christ made such a mighty impact upon men after His lifetime, what possible reason is there for assuming that, while He was alive in the flesh amongst them, He had no more powers over men than any human being might possess? In the light of this, there can be no hesitation in believing that the personality of Jesus exercised an influence on the world of His day, even as it has done ever since. We are but attributing to Him when He was visibly present the same power which it cannot be denied He has when no longer in the flesh. The miracle stories cannot have been deliberately fabricated; that is an absurd proposition. There must have been a basis for them in the life and acts of Jesus. That, of course, does not authenticate the miraculous tradition as it stands; but it does give us a licence to examine that tradition and see the varying degrees of probability that attach to its various parts.

Our subject does not require an examination of the Nature miracles. Some of these need no supernatural explanation. The feeding of the five thousand was certainly a miracle, but was it not rather a miracle of co-operation, whereby Jew and Gentile were made to sit down to eat and share with one another? Or was not the story of the coin in the fish's mouth simply Christ's picturesque way of telling Peter that his own calling would readily supply the money for the tax? Moreover, when memories are stirred to recall happenings of some time ago, which were observed with no thought that they were later to be set down, there is inevitably some loss through the passage of time and confusion of similars, such as the parable and the cursing of the fig tree.

If we would but drop that question-begging word 'miracle', and think what outstanding success has, throughout history, attended the work of healing in some men's hands and still does attend it, we should readily admit that one would expect Christ's powers in this respect to be as wonderful as His own personality. No reasonable critic is likely to deny that Christ did great things for those who were sick in mind or body. The only question is to the extent to which we can accept the evidence. We should judge that as fairly and unemotionally as we discuss the testimony of Tacitus or Josephus.

For example, we may have some misgivings about mass healings, especially as they were exceptional, most of our Lord's patients being individuals. The gathering of the sick, after the cure of Peter's wife's mother, is recorded by all three Synoptists. Matthew says Jesus healed all, Mark that He healed many, Luke that He laid His hands on every one of them and healed them. All agree that a large number came for healing, but not upon the number healed. Some think that the word used here by all three, that from which our own word 'therapy' comes, means 'treated' rather than 'cured'. Jesus made it manifest that it was not a case of 'If I can', but 'If thou canst', and where there was unbelief He could do no mighty works. It is inevitable, therefore, that Jesus must have treated some whom He did not cure. He treated all who came, and those who had the faith He needed in them He cured; but mass faith, which is almost always mass credulity produced by suggestion, is not likely to have been the sort of faith Jesus required.

It is also obvious that the healing work of Jesus needed different methods in

different cases, exactly as does the work of a physician. Not only so, but there is evidence in some cases of a greater cost to the Healer. Much depended on the mental state of the patient; and it was this factor, rather than any difficulty in applying His healing power, which accounted for the harder cases. Sometimes it seemed easy. When Jesus told the man with the paralysed or 'withered' hand to stretch it, the most likely reply would have been that he was unable to do any such thing. Yet this man at once, at Jesus's bidding, attempted the impossible without question and achieved it. This is, indeed, 'the obedience of faith', a strong faith which at once made the healing possible. Others lacked such power, and demanded more from the Healer in consequence.

On one occasion only did Jesus need a further application of His power. A blind man at Bethsaida was brought to Jesus, and his friends, not the man himself, begged for his healing. Jesus took the man by the hand and led him away. Surely the touch of that hand clasping his must have helped to create faith. Jesus led him away from the curious crowd to a quieter place—another factor in the process of raising the man's faith. Using saliva was another step. The wounded animal licks its wound, and this led to the belief that saliva had a healing virtue. Then Jesus asked if the man saw anything. Obviously he had once possessed sight and become blind, for he replied that he saw, but not in proportion; men seemed like trees. So Jesus gave his eyes a second touch and the man received full sight. This is clearly a harder case than, for example, that of the blind optimist, Bartimaeus, who, unable to find Jesus by sight, tried valiantly by voice, and, unabashed by the rebuke of the crowd, cried out the more. Jesus asked him what he wanted. His reply showed that he was not crying for alms, but for sight; and he received it.

On the occasion of the healing of a woman with haemorrhage, Jesus found 'that the power proceeding from him had gone forth' and was aware by that means, rather than by touch, that someone in the crowd had laid hands on His robe. 'Who touched my garments?' He asked, and the disciples made the obvious remark that in such a throng it was an absurd thing to ask. But the woman heard and confessed, trembling, as if she had stolen something from Him. Her faith, was the reply, had made her whole. On another occasion, the disciples left behind when Jesus and the three of the inner circle, Peter, James, and John, had gone to the Mount of Transfiguration had attempted to cure a hard case and failed. When Jesus had effected a cure, these disciples, mortified by their failure, reported it to Him. The reply was suggestive: 'This kind can come out by nothing save by prayer'. The Revisers omit the words 'and fasting' rightly, for they are not found in the best of the ancient manuscripts and Jesus was not in the habit of referring to any such value in fasting. What He said amounted to this: 'Your prayer level is not yet up to undertaking such cases.' That is important as indicating that power in prayer gave power in healing.

There are just a few of the indications that the healing work of Jesus required different conditions in order to be effective in different cases. We see, too, that it cost Him something physically and spiritually; His withdrawal, after being immersed in healings, to some quiet place indicates His need of physical rest and spiritual reinforcement. But the cost also varied. The centurion who begged healing for his servant humbly told Jesus he was unworthy of His presence in his house, adding: 'Only say the word and my servant shall be

healed'. This did, indeed, prove sufficient in this case, but in many others far more than this was necessary.

Jesus commissioned His disciples and missionaries to heal the sick and cast out demons. In some cases recorded in the Gospels they did; but, as in the case of the epileptic whom they failed to heal, this part of their work was not done in the manner or with the success of their Master. The same thing applies to the healings recorded in the Acts. One gains the impression that they were only subsidiary to the main task of the Apostles, and in no way an integral part of their ministry as were the healings of Jesus. In the Acts, Luke often records that many signs and wonders were wrought, without giving details. Without denying that healing was wrought by the Apostles, it must be said that the records of their healing work are less impressive than those of Jesus, and show less of the method of healing. One of the best attested cases is that of Publius at Malta, for there Luke was present. Luke says, according to the R.V., that Paul healed Publius and cured the rest who came. As a medical man, Luke no doubt meant to distinguish the two sorts of cases, and the fact that he used different words suggests a difference in the results which followed.

In two cases at least, Paul's association with healing is quite unlike that of Christ. He is reported by Luke to have been angered at the half-crazed sooth-saying girl who cried out on him at Philippi. Since the girl professed that Paul and Silas were servants of the most High God, it is quite likely that when Paul adjured her in the name of Christ, she considered he had put a spell upon her and ceased to prophesy in consequence. She had not asked for release from her 'spirit', and it was not pity for her, but annoyance at her, which prompted Paul. The other case was the using of handkerchiefs and aprons from Paul's body as holy relics of healing power. We can hardly blame the people, for the belief in the powers of the holy relic still abides in Roman Catholic Christianity, but if Paul knew this was going on, it is strange that he did not stop it. Luke was not present when these healings occurred, and records them only from hearsay. It is not surprising that things belonging to Paul, should, like the shadow of Peter, have virtue attributed them, but it is surprising that the practice was allowed, and apparently approved, for otherwise we can hardly imagine Luke recording it.

The case of Eutychus may well have been one of diagnosis, not of raising from the dead. If the youth suffered from concussion, it would certainly have been thought that he was dead. Paul, following what was said of Elisha and the child of Shunem, embraced the lad and declared that life was still in him, as indeed it proved. That simple record hardly suggests that Paul raised the young man from death.

In short, the healings of the Acts fall far below those of Jesus, and, in the main, refer to individual cases, not to systematic healing work like that of the Master.

Reference to healing in the New Testament is always to spiritual healing. There is no record that Luke used his medical gifts in the ordinary way, or, for that matter, took part in any healing work at all. The authorship of the Pastoral Epistles is not our concern here, but the incidental personal notes which occur seem inexplicable unless they are taken from some letter of St Paul. In one of these we hear that Timothy, on account of his digestive troubles and

frequent attacks, is advised to take wine rather than water. This does not suggest that Paul had used his powers of healing for his colleague, but is a bit of advice any friend might have given. Nor did Paul seek spiritual healing from anyone for his thorn in the flesh. He prayed for its removal and, satisfied that that was not God's will, left it at that. Ordinary medical treatment, apart from Jesus's words that the sick not the healthy need the physician, finds mention only in the incident of the woman who had spent her all on the physicians and was no better but rather worse. (Is there, by the way, any significance in the fact that Luke stops short with the words 'no better'?). In view, however, of the warm eulogy given by Jesus ben Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) to the physician, it is clear that medical work was held in esteem.

The one passage that does require notice in the epistles is that of James 5₁₃₋₁₆. Here it is ordained that the sick man is to call for the elders of the Church, who are to anoint him with oil, and that prayer shall save him that is sick and if he has committed sins they shall be forgiven; men are to pray and confess their sins one to another and they shall be healed. Vicarious prayer is mentioned in the First Epistle of John, which says that so far as sin not unto death is concerned, a man shall pray for his brother who so sins, and 'God will give him life for them that sin not unto death'.

Vicarious faith, then, is recognized in the New Testament as availing in sickness and sin. This seems at variance with the strict doctrine that without repentance and faith there is no salvation. May we not think that, just as the father of the Prodigal ran to meet his son and fell on his neck and kissed him much (as the marginal reading reminds us) before he had made his confession, so God may receive us, not because we have repented but that we may repent. The idea of vicarious blessing is, of course, well known in the Old Testament. Rabbinic theology accepted the doctrine that the sins of the fathers could be visited upon the children, but logically enough held that this must also apply to the faith of the fathers; the covenant of Abraham conveyed the blessings of Abraham. St Paul's doctrine of imputed righteousness seems related to this Jewish thought. Whereas we make the individual the unit, the East still thinks of the tribe, clan or family as so bound together that the individual's actions have their sequel in the descendants.

It is unquestionable that Jesus required faith as a pre-condition of healing, but it is equally clear that it was in some cases vicarious faith. In the instance the man let down by his four bearers to the feet of Jesus, it is said that He, 'seeing their faith', took up the case. Were this the only example, it might seem unjustifiable to stress the pronoun 'their' as excluding that of the patient, but it is far from being so. The faith of parents was accepted for their children, and that of the centurion for his servant. Here again we touch the idea of the unity of the family, and since the Church is the family of God, its prayers for its members certainly come within the scope of this thought.

Jesus did not speak of vicarious pardon, except in so far as in the passage just quoted. "Seeing their faith," He said to the sick man, "Thy sins are forgiven." But the prayer of Jesus at Calvary, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do,' is indeed significant. Jesus never asked of God what He knew was not God's will, and He therefore believed that His prayer would avail for those who sinned in their ignorance, and were unrepentant because they saw

nothing of which to repent. This would not apply to those who commit a sin 'unto death', as 1 John has it, of which he says, 'Not concerning this do I say he should make request'; but it does apply to those who sin in blindness or ignorance.

The practice of intercession for the sick and sinful can claim a secure basis in the New Testament. One concludes with the somewhat saddening thought that it finds small expression in the prayers of the Church today.

E. S. WATERHOUSE

SPIRITUAL HEALING IN THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

IF A WRITER is to trace in outline the history of spiritual healing in the Christian Church, he must first state clearly what he means by it. I mean two things. First, direct healing by God through His body the Church without drugs or surgery; and, secondly, co-operation between the Church and the medical profession in what is at root a joint task to which each side makes its specific contribution. Perfect spiritual healing would take place when the whole personality, spirit, mind and body was integrated through harmony with God.

In dealing with Church history, Latourette discerns periods of alternating advance and recession. We may follow him, and trace in the history of spiritual healing a period of advance, followed by one of recession, itself succeeded by a further time of revival and advance, which we may hope and pray will not be followed by another recession. So let us look—

I. AT THE PERIOD OF ADVANCE

Instances of spiritual healing are found in the Old Testament, e.g. in the healing of Naaman, Ahaz, and Hezekiah. It flowered in the healing activity of our Lord, recorded in the Gospels, in which one out of every eight verses is concerned with healing. It is not for me to discuss our Lord's healing miracles, which clearly He regarded as signs of the Messianic Age and of the Kingdom of God He came to bring. But I must say just this. His charge to the Twelve and the Seventy, and His promise in John 14₁₂, 'He that believeth on me, the

the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto the Father', show clearly that He intended this healing work to be continued, and commissioned the Church to carry on His healing ministry. And Mark 16^{17, 18}, though they belong to what is probably not the original ending of the Gospel, testify at least to the conviction of the early Church that it had received its Lord's commission to continue healing. And continue healing it did. Dr Evelyn Frost tells us (*Christian Healing*, p. 63) that healing is mentioned nineteen times in the Acts, and Dr Leslie Weatherhead (*Psychology, Religion and Healing*, pp. 81ff.) enumerates the seven chief instances. Peter and John heal a lame man at the Gate Beautiful (3²⁻¹⁰); patients are cured by the shadow of Peter and handkerchiefs which had touched Paul (5¹⁵⁻¹⁶ and 19¹²); Ananias restores Saul's sight (9¹⁷); Peter heals Aeneas' palsy (9³²⁻⁴); Paul heals a cripple at Lystra (14⁸⁻¹⁰) and exorcises a girl with a spirit of divination (16¹⁶⁻¹⁸); and Paul heals Publius' father of fever and dysentery (28⁷⁻⁸). Healing continued during the first three and a quarter centuries A.D. Evidence from the Fathers and Apologists is set out fully and convincingly by Dr Evelyn Frost in Chapter IV, Section 4, of *Christian Healing*, and by Dr Leslie Weatherhead in Section I, Chapter II of his *Psychology, Religion and Healing*. There is no space to give detailed quotations, but anyone can consult these chapters. Direct healing is the normal and expected thing.

But with the conversion of Constantine and the adoption of Christianity as the official religion of the Roman Empire things changed, and we come to—

II. THE PERIOD OF RECESSION AND DECLINE

With the period after Constantine religion became safe, established, and conventional, the spiritual temperature dropped from its early red-hot faith and expectancy, and divisions and controversies slowed down the urge of the Spirit. Physical and medical science took the place of spiritual healing by God's direct action. Spiritual healing ceased gradually to be the norm; it was regarded as abnormal, and was associated not with the 'saints' which the New Testament called all Christians to aspire to be, but was largely confined to canonized 'Saints' with a capital S. Unction ceased to be the normal method of healing which St James claimed it to be, and became Extreme Unction, the prelude not to health, but to death. And as the centuries passed, the Renaissance focused man's attention on the results of his own skill and away from God's power, and in due course the eighteenth century cast a chilly eye on all forms of enthusiasm and faith. It is true that spiritual healing lingered on sporadically. Witnesses to this are the lives of St Bernard of Clairvaux (1091-1153), St Francis of Assisi (1182-1226), St Catherine of Siena (1347-1380), Martin Luther and Francis Xavier in the sixteenth century, George Fox in the seventeenth century, John Wesley in the eighteenth, and Father Mathew, Pastor Blumhardt, Father John of Cronstadt, and James Moore Hickson in more recent times (cf. Leslie Weatherhead, *Psychology, Religion and Healing*, p. 95). But these sporadic instances of men and women who healed solely in communion with Christ are a far cry from the flood tide of the Gospels and early centuries. This dubious and half-apologetic attitude has continued until fairly recent times, and even now persists in certain minds.

In addition to the causes of decline which have emerged in the last section, Dr Frost, in a brilliant ninth chapter of her *Christian Healing*, gives many other reasons why the position of spiritual healing is so different today from what it was in the early Church, e.g.:

(1) The association of spiritual healing with relics and shrines often laid itself open to abuses and superstition.

(2) Cures by spiritual healing were not open to 'control' observation in the same way as clinical cases.

(3) Science gave a 'scientific' explanation of Christian healing, and so apparently cut away the ground from under religion's feet.

(4) The Church began to view sickness as a punishment for sin sent by God, whereas the fact is that it is not sent by God, and to regard it as a punishment for sin, though true enough in a way, requires much qualification and explanation.

(5) The Church is a very conservative, traditional body, and has often opposed and denounced the most adventurous of medical discoveries for the relief and cure of sickness. This has been partly due to the mistaken view that disease is God's will. But it is a great loss, because it has not only hindered the acceptance of scientific discovery, but delayed the recovery of the sense of being commissioned to heal. As the Rev. Harry Hutchison points out in his scholarly book, *The Church and Spiritual Healing*, the Church of today merely *hopes* that Christ has not withdrawn the power given to His first disciples; the early Church *assumed* and was quite certain that He had not.

Dr Frost gives two further important reasons for the changed attitude, which I can only mention without comment: firstly, the shifting of emphasis, owing to the growth of evangelicalism, from the Resurrection to the Cross; and secondly, the departmental view of life, which splits up what is really one self and allots the body to the doctor and the mind to the psychologist, leaving to the ministry only the spirit, and that largely with a view to its preparation for eternity.

But we must go back on our tracks again and think of—

III. THE MODERN ADVANCE AND REVIVAL

which all hope may this time be permanent and progressive.

Hypnotism, mesmerism, and that curious amalgam of truth and error, Christian Science, challenged the Church of the nineteenth and still more of the twentieth century to rouse herself from her apathy and regain her lost gift and commission to heal, because they emphasized the great influence for good or evil which mind and spirit have on the body.

With the turn of the century, Christian healers began to multiply, both those who possessed a charismatic gift of healing by touch and those who relied simply on communion with the Risen Christ, and guilds and societies began to be formed. The two most widely known of these are the Guild of Health and the Guild of St Raphael.

The Guild of Health, Edward Wilson House, 26 Queen Anne Street, Harley

Street, London, W.1, is an interdenominational society started in 1905 by Harold Anson, Percy Dearmer, and Conrad Noel. Its objects are, as stated in its monthly magazine, *For Health and Healing*: (i) to bring together Christian people, including doctors, psychologists and ministers of religion, to work in fellowship for fuller health both for the individual and the community; (ii) to enable all members to study the interaction between physical, mental and spiritual factors in well-being; (iii) to sustain and strengthen by prayer the sick, those who minister them, and all those who exercise the Divine gift of healing; (iv) to help men and women to realize in themselves, as members of the Christian family, the abundant life offered in Christ. It seeks to carry out these objects by means of prayer and mental and spiritual re-education.

The Guild of St Raphael, 33 Wilton Place, London, S.W.1, formed in 1915, is a purely Anglican society. Its aims are: (i) to unite in a fellowship of prayer, within the Catholic Church, those who hold the faith that our Lord wills to work in and through His Church for the health of her members in spirit, mind, and body; (ii) to promote the belief that God wills the conquest of disease, as well as sin, through the power of the living Christ; (iii) to guide the sick, and those who care for them, to Christ as the source of healing. These aims the Guild seeks to attain by intercession, and unction, and the laying on of hands, which it regards as part of the normal function of the ordained ministry. It publishes a quarterly magazine, and works in very friendly co-operation with the Guild of Health.

Among other societies have been the Emmanuel Movement in America (which has now changed its name), Milton Abbey in Dorset during the time of the Rev. John Maillard, the Friends' Spiritual Healing Fellowship, the Spiritual Healing Committee of the Methodist Church which will have special treatment in this series, and many others, good, bad, and indifferent. I feel I must utter a word of warning against mass healing services, many of which are widely publicized and often badly prepared for, and in connexion with which there is little or no after-care.

I will end my historical survey with a mention of three important developments. (1) The growth of psychosomatic medicine. This is finding the origin of much of disease in the maladjustment of mind or spirit. (2) The Churches' Council of Healing. This Council, which owed its inception to the initiative of Archbishop Temple in 1944, and of which the Guild of Health was the mid-wife, has important significance. Its chairman is the Archbishop of Canterbury, and it is composed of representatives of the main healing societies and of the medical profession. And its main object is the co-ordination of the work done by various healing movements, and the promotion of fuller co-operation between the ministry and doctors. Its work is commended in an important statement in the *British Medical Journal* of 8th November 1947. (3) The action taken in the Lower and Upper Houses of Canterbury Convocation in 1952. In this I played a not unimportant part. I moved two motions in the Lower House, one commending the modern revival of spiritual healing to the sympathetic attention of the Church, and especially of the clergy, and one requesting the Archbishop to appoint a Joint Committee on the subject. He has subsequently set up a Commission, of which both theologians and doctors are members. Its report is eagerly awaited.

Such in very brief outline is the history of spiritual healing in the Christian Church. What are the main lessons which the Church of today needs to learn from it? If it is to stop the drift to unorthodox healing sects, and meet the outsiders' challenge that it should demonstrate its effect on daily living, the Church must do certain things:

(1) It must so soak itself in the healing miracles of the Gospels, the Acts, and the first three centuries that it recovers and deepens its sense of conviction that it has been commissioned by Christ Himself to heal. Spiritual healing is not a modern stunt, but the revival of an old divinely-given function of the Church.

(2) It must set its scholars and theologians on to a more intensive exploration of certain problems—for example, how God's higher spiritual laws work, what is the real purpose of intercession and how it is effected, and, granting that all healing comes from God, what is the something 'extra' that spiritual healing, as distinct from physical or psychological healing, confers.

(3) It must, while insisting that the Church has its own specific contribution to make to healing, try to work in ever closer co-operation with the medical profession. Its object is not to abolish doctors (that would be absurd), though it may be to draw the attention of some of them to the crucial importance of the spiritual factor in the prevention and cure of disease.

(4) It must with proper humility confess that spiritual methods are not necessary or in fact relevant to every type of disease.

(5) While it makes the foregoing admission, it must clear its mind that bodily health in the last resort is not an end to be sought merely for its own sake, but is in the ultimate analysis a by-product of the life of the whole self, spirit, mind and body lived in harmony with God Himself.

H. C. ROBINS

SPIRITUAL HEALING IN THE METHODIST CHURCH

AN ARTICLE on 'Spiritual Healing', by Dr Leslie D. Weatherhead in *The Methodist Recorder* for 26th February 1925, may perhaps be said to date the beginning of the modern Methodist interest in the ancient Christian gift of healing. But despite many conversations amongst unofficial groups, and slowly awakening thought, it was not until the year 1937 that the Methodist Church, by resolution of Conference, formally set up a 'Spiritual Healing Committee'. This, again, was at Dr Weatherhead's suggestion, to whom all honour must be paid as the prime mover in this field.

From almost its earliest years, the Methodist Committee can fairly be said to have been both a pioneer and leader in the recovery of this aspect, not only of Christian teaching, but of pastoral life and work. Especially has it stressed the psychosomatic relationship and, in consequence, has always sought close co-operation with the medical profession. In this direction, along detailed and specialist lines, has lain the peculiar contribution it has made to the development of the subject in the modern Church. Spiritual healing is not to be put over against medicine or in opposition to it. The Church and medicine have from the beginning of the Committee's work been seen as one integrated whole, doctor and minister working together as colleagues in their approach to the problems of the human psyche.

At the Methodist Conference of 1937, three propositions received unanimous agreement and were recommended to the attention of the whole Church. It was agreed that in the training of our Ministers it was important to give adequate consideration to the psychological aspects of their work. Theological education must remain primarily and essentially concerned with Biblical and theological subjects; there was no intention then, nor has there been one at any time, of turning ministers into amateur psychologists. The supreme task of the minister is to preach the Gospel. But it was felt that he should receive sufficient psychological training to enable him to separate mental from specifically spiritual problems, and to recognize those people who needed a psychiatrist before they could be helped spiritually. As time has gone on, this injunction of Conference has been more and more heeded in theological education and there is no doubt that it has exercised a wide influence outside Methodism.

It was also agreed that an attempt should be made, whenever possible, to set up some experimental groups of doctors and ministers who might, with profit both to themselves, and to patients and parishioners, co-operate together in the healing of the sick. Religious life and experience, the resources of medical skill and knowledge, the new light on the depths of human personality afforded by modern psychology, were all envisaged by this resolution as necessary colleagues in healing. The Methodist itinerancy has rendered the setting up of such permanent 'clinics' a rather difficult problem, but, as will be shown later, some progress has been made towards this end.

The third matter of importance the Committee was charged to urge on the Church was the need for more intercessory prayer for sick people. Nothing at

that time appears to have been said as to the desirability or otherwise of public healing services. But ministers were asked to give thought to the formation of groups of praying people definitely pledged to seeking a link between the sick person and the prayer of the Church.

In 1937 this was a formidable and original programme in an area of neglected Christian thought and practice. It was not surprising that there were those in Conference, and elsewhere in the Church, who thought of it all with aversion as the fad of a few eccentrics who were departing from the main highway of the Gospel.

Yet was this so? If in the years since Wesley's death in 1791 the subject was completely lost sight of, this cannot be said either of Wesley himself or of the men raised up to work with him as itinerant preachers. Indeed, Wesley may be said with truth to be the one man who more than any others blazed this trail for the modern Church. He was a pioneer in this country of co-operation between doctors and clergy in the healing of the sick. The present Conference Committee simply inherits and carries on his tradition.

From almost the beginning of his ministry, Wesley was interested in medical matters. His *Journal* tells us how he studied anatomy and physic. It may be that he derived his interest in such matters from the Moravians. The Orphan House that Francke founded at Halle was possessed of 'an apothecary's shop . . . furnished with all sorts of medicines'. The Orphan House at Herrnhut had a similar shop, and there seems to be little doubt but that Wesley closely observed it. His own itinerant preachers at times combined physical healing with their gospel ministry. Matthew Lowes, for example, in 1770 sold a balsam which was widely popular, and though Wesley suggested he should retire and become a local preacher, the early Methodist records reveal that others besides him attempted doctoring of one kind and another. The libraries at London, Bristol, and Newcastle which were for Wesley's own use were to include books on physic. His interest in electrical treatment was active almost from the time that its use began in England. The modern shock treatment was anticipated by him in a rudimentary fashion, and he himself on more than one occasion sought opportunities to be 'electrified'. In 1746 he set up what in modern times would be called a 'clinic' to give medicines to poor people, and ten years later began to 'electrify' for various illnesses at no fewer than four centres in London. The dispensary at Bristol was always hard at work. Hundreds of people came for treatment, and were met in 1747 by an apothecary and a surgeon. His *Primitive Physic*, the most popular book on Medicine in the eighteenth century, came out in 1747, and ran into twenty-three editions by the time of his death. Nowadays we smile at its bizarre remedies; but it was far superior to any non-professional work at the time, and its quaintness and non-scientific prescriptions must not blind us to its significance.

Wesley's *Journal* makes it plain that he believed in a connexion between prayer and healing. He believed that healing was of God. Fletcher's recovery after prayer, Mrs Welch's getting better after receiving Holy Communion, Jane Bates's conversion healing her body as well as her soul, and the cure of the maniac at Osmotherley are some examples that come to mind. It may be that Wesley himself possessed 'odic force', but whether he did or not, he was one of the first in England to discern the relationship of body and mind, the psychosomatic

problem of our own time. It is true he records that recovery did not always follow prayer, and throughout he seems to have equated sickness with the Will of God, yet in the field of spiritual healing he has left the Methodist Church a tradition which it is only just beginning to recognize and accept.

After Wesley's death this tradition faded out and was lost, not to be revived till the Conference of 1937. Diligent search amidst much literature and many memoirs of the middle periods of Methodist history has failed to reveal any references to it. It is true that Adam Clarke records the miraculous healing of a lady whose hair had become diseased; but apart from that, interest in medical or healing matters on the part of the Church in her pastoral capacity is nowhere apparent. It is the present Spiritual Healing Committee that alone bridges the gulf between Wesley and Methodists today.

Many people are so unaware of what the Committee has done since its formation in 1937 that it is worth while to say something of its work. When it was set up, Conference dispensed it from the necessity of making a yearly Report, recognizing that much of its work would be in research and its conclusions provisional. But of late years it has reported frequently and has received mention both in the Methodist and daily Press. In 1946 it formed the Methodist Society for Medical and Pastoral Psychology, which has a considerable membership and aims at drawing ministers and doctors into joint study and prayer. Groups of the two vocations are now meeting in different parts of the country and much has been done to promote a new fellowship between the medical and spiritual approaches to healing. For some years a highly successful Annual Conference has been held in Cambridge, the attendance at which is growing larger every year, and quiet days, conferences and group meetings on a larger scale continue to be promoted in other parts of the country. The Society publishes an occasional *Bulletin* which brings news of this particular field of work to its members and seeks to keep them in touch with one another and up to date in their thought and reading.

In co-operation with the Methodist Book Room, a series of 'Spiritual Healing Booklets' has been issued. Some of them have already had a wide circulation, and new booklets continue to be produced. Written by ministers and doctors, they have sought to set the subject against the background both of New Testament scholarship and the practice of modern psychiatry. At the time of writing, the Committee is considering a scheme for the setting up of a 'Diploma of Pastoral Psychology', the aim of which is to equip the minister to co-operate with the doctor in such a way as to convince the latter that he has some qualifications for so doing. The scheme is still in its early stages and much has to be done before it can be launched, but steady progress is being made in this direction.

Much private and individual help is given almost every week of the year in recommending psychologists, psychiatrists, and treatments sympathetic to the spiritual approach to healing. This is not in the least an attempt to discriminate amongst professional men or to give medical advice, but rather to hold out a helping hand to ministers who may be perplexed about certain personal problems arising in their circuits and who are uncertain how to act for the best in advising their people. In addition, much help and advice is given to those who are interested in forming groups specially pledged to intercession for the sick. There

has been a big increase in these in recent years. Their presence shows how seriously the Methodist people today are taking the revival of Christian healing, and the Committee is doing all it can to keep this steadily growing interest on right lines, in tune both with the teaching of the New Testament and the findings of psychology and medicine.

The Conference has not seen fit to recommend in our Churches public services of healing, open to everybody; it has suggested that private services may be held for the 'patient' and his personal friends and relatives. The Committee has stressed the advisability of a medical diagnosis being obtained, if possible, in every case, and especially of spiritual preparation by the minister, together with an adequate medical 'follow-up'. The reasons for this are so apparent and have been so widely publicized that it is not necessary to consider them in this short article. What is, above all, necessary in such services is that the sick person should be brought into a living fellowship with God, so that whether healed or not, he is sure of the divine love. Too precise an emphasis on bodily healing alone may result at times in spiritual depression or loss of faith, and a 'crankiness' which replaces bodily troubles by character defects. The Committee laid before the 1954 Conference a Service for the Laying on of Hands on the Sick, which Conference adopted and ordered to be printed. It is now available to all who feel called to use such methods either in Church or in the sickroom.

Interest in this work has spread overseas to the Methodist Churches of Australia and New Zealand. Many enquiries come from Methodists there and from different parts of the mission field. In the U.S.A. interest in the Methodist Society for Medical and Pastoral Psychology has led to Methodist ministers becoming corresponding members, and from time to time news is exchanged about the progress of healing work in the churches here and there.

It only remains to say that our Methodist Committee has been active in promoting interdenominational work along these lines. Its members were associated with the formation of the Churches' Council of Healing, a body which, under the Presidency of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, federates the different Churches into one. Further, much lecturing on these subjects in the Churches of various denominations has been promoted. The Committee, for example, has a team which for some years has been travelling about the country giving courses of addresses on religion and medicine which, judging by the attendances, have awakened wide interest and met a real need for guidance in this subject.

The Committee is now contemplating preparing a detailed report of its findings after twenty years' work in this field. Already some provisional conclusions have been laid before Conference which may be briefly mentioned.

Divine healing for body, mind, and spirit was an essential part of our Lord's Ministry. It was accepted and practised by the Apostles and the early Church, and was handed on as a responsibility to subsequent ages. The separation between doctor and minister brought about by modern science should not blind the Church to its inheritance of the healing gospel.

Certain individuals possess the gift of healing. Sometimes it appears to be a hereditary endowment, handed down in families as part of the constitution of their natures. Sometimes it comes specially to certain individuals, in whom it

is directly connected with the growth and achievement of religious experience. Yet it is not intrinsically the possession of all Christian believers, and they are not to be blamed if they do not possess it.

This gift is best exercised within the Christian community and the local church. It should be under the control of the Church. The Committee believes that the Church is being called today to this healing, for it is an undoubted element in the Gospel she has received. But to attain and practise it needs a deepened spiritual experience, and it is to that that the emphasis on spiritual healing is calling the whole Church.

The supreme aim of all healing of this spiritual nature is to achieve the unity of the worshipper with God. Any Healing Service should seek to symbolize the dedication of the 'patient' in his renewed surrender to God. He trusts God whether he recovers or not. The end of all 'spiritual healing' is the Glory of God, not the attempt to use Him in order to get well.

It seems certain that there will be much increase of interest in this subject in the future. The Methodist Church may rest assured that her leadership has been strong and vigorous and that she will continue to be in the forefront of research, experiment and, above all, prayer.

JOHN CROWLESMITH

SPIRITUAL HEALING—AS A DOCTOR SEES IT

HEALTH AND healing have always been an integral part of the Christian message, and is this to be wondered at? Who is there who does not know how disturbing a thing disease of any kind can be? All is going well in a family; life is ordered and happy; suddenly, like a bolt from the blue, illness comes into the home, the husband or wife is struck down and work is stopped, and the means of livelihood affected. Life in consequence is terribly changed, and not only for the family or individual concerned, but for many others—for industry, for the State. It was estimated recently that ten million working hours had been lost to industry in one year through functional nervous diseases alone.

Now this is a problem which affects us all. No one can contract out of it. We are all involved in the possibility and problem of disease. Health is not merely an endowment, something we are given or not given; it is an achievement. To be healthy, one must be growing more and more healthy; to be well, one must always be getting better. This principle applies to all ages and stages of life: even when the body is growing old, in the autumn of its days, the mind and the spirit should still be growing; as 'our outward man' perishes, 'our inward man' should be 'renewed day by day'. To be static is dangerous: a cancer is a part of the body that is not growing as it should; it is regressing—going back to the primitive.

There is an impulse in man to grow up, to develop and express his true nature, the instincts and faculties with which he has been endowed. If through lack of opportunity, or ignorance, or a feeling of inadequacy, this urge of life is frustrated and turns inward, something which was good becomes sour and bad. 'Virtue itself turns vice when misapplied, and vice sometimes by virtue is dignified.' The *élan vital* will find outlet—a wrong one if it cannot find a right one. How otherwise can we account for Hitler or Stalin, or any other dictator, either at home or abroad? The whole business of education is to draw out the natural force which is within the individual so that it finds its proper use and place. This is the best way to prevent disease.

The higher up the biological scale we go, the more we find this impulse becoming purposeful and intelligent, until in man we are aware of a spirit that can co-operate with the Spirit of all life, with the Creator who knows better than we what life is for, and how the health and the healing of the individual and the nation are to be achieved.

Recently a patient came to see me at my hospital; she was depressed and had lost all interest in her work and home; she was much worried in consequence and could not sleep. An additional worry was the fact that her doctor had told her there was nothing fundamentally wrong with her. I had to explain that what he really meant was that there was nothing organically wrong with her body; in view of the fact that she had lost all joy of living, the real question was whether there was anything fundamentally right.

Health, we are beginning to realize, is not just a physical matter. The body certainly has a tremendous influence upon the mind; 'We are not ourselves', says Shakespeare, 'when nature, being oppressed, commands the mind to suffer with the body'. Every day we notice how physical ill-health can affect, not only the mentality, but even the spiritual outlook of an individual. This is one of the most painful tragic facts of human life, and for this reason a gospel of salvation if it is to be adequate must be concerned—and potent—to heal the body as well as the soul.

But if the body affects the mind, the mind has a great influence upon the body. I happen to specialize in the psychological side of medicine; and if medical psychology has done anything, it has exploded the idea that a man can be divided into sections which have nothing to do with each other. It has shown decisively that health is not just a matter of the body, or of the mind, but of the essential unity of both. For health we require good food, fresh air, sufficient rest, exercise, and work. Man does not live by bread alone; food for the mind, intellectual interests, and all the things that refresh the spirit are just as

necessary. 'Better a dinner of herbs where love is, than a stalled ox and hatred therewith.' It is indeed a better dinner; it does you more good. 'A merry heart doeth good like a medicine; but a broken spirit drieth up the bones.' Perfectly true, and therefore we must unite and not keep apart these two aspects of our nature. Elijah, after his battle with the priests of Baal, wanted to die; he felt he was no better than his fathers, not up to his job—a clear case of nervous exhaustion. When asleep under the juniper tree, he had a dream in which he was told by an angel to rise and eat, which he did. He required food; but it was because he believed that an angel had prescribed it—that God had a care for him—that he was able to go in the strength of that food for forty days.

We separate too much the physical and the spiritual. They are different—that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit—but they are related and have need of each other. What God has joined together, let not man put asunder. It is a right trend on the part of medical science to regard the body and the mind, not as separate, but as different aspects of one unity. St Paul prayed that the Thessalonians might be sanctified wholly by the God of peace; that spirit, soul and body might be preserved *entire*.

A very striking illustration of this interdependence is given in the report of St Mark on the healing of the paralysed man who was let in through the roof. The patient came to be cured of a physical malady, and the first thing that happened was an assurance that his sins were forgiven. It must have seemed both to the patient and to his friends a somewhat irrelevant observation; some also thought it irreverent and blasphemous, and questioned Christ's authority. Then the procedure was reversed. Instead of an argument, they were given a demonstration: 'That ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (He said to the sick of the palsy), I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy bed and go thy way into thine house.' It is clear that Christ, if He was not justifying His moral authority by a physical action, was at any rate pointing out that a separation must not be made between the one realm and the other.

Similarly, we do not feel that there is anything arbitrary or out of place in Christ's miracles; they seem to follow naturally in the wake of His personality. The inner life is that which gives significance and value to the outer life, which is usually a good test of the truth and validity of the inner.

The external world is the stage on which we have to play our role in the great drama; and we are well cast for our part, if only we bring to it the energy and the vision which the inner life supplies. Here, as elsewhere, it is true that what we get out of anything depends very largely on what we bring to it. A zoologist will find in a stagnant pool what will keep him interested for months; you and I would only be depressed by the sight of it. We are too apt to confuse reality with externality, to suppose that the real world is the world that we can see or handle or assess. The reality of a flower for us is not just the flower, but what its beauty and fragrance mean for us; it depends quite as much on what we bring to the flower as what it brings to us. It needs, as Lotze has said, 'the sentient mind of man to discover what it is mutely striving to express'. As we get older we become less dependent upon external sources of enjoyment and find these more in ourselves. Lacordaire says finely that the inner life is the conversation of oneself with oneself:

Every man has this word within which makes his life true; it is this inner life which makes the whole valour of the man. There goes one in a purple cloak who is only a miserable because the word which he says to himself is the word of a miserable; and there going down the street is a beggar who is a great man because the word which he says to himself is the word of a hero or a saint.

Psychological medicine affords ample confirmation of all this. At a clinic which I attended for the scientific treatment of delinquency, some of the cases are classified under the term 'behaviour problems'; and most of these can be traced not only to physical, but to emotional, and mental causes.

Let me quote what Sir Henry Cohen, an ex-President of the B.M.A., said in his Presidential Address at the Annual Meeting of the Association:

Medicine is not all science. There are many medical problems which defy measurement. Human life is full of imponderables, for man is not a physical being only. He has emotions and appetites which cannot be measured, though they profoundly influence his physical welfare. Bodily disturbances may be, and commonly are, the expression of his loves and hates, his passions and fears, his worries and anxieties; the thumping heart, the cold sweat, the weak and tremulous knees of fright are but simple examples of this unity of body and mind. The greatest danger to which medicine in the scientific era has been exposed is that of overlooking that men, both patients and doctors, are sentient social beings, and of forgetting that, however sensitive and specific our laboratory tests, and however elaborate and complicated our instrumental methods of investigation may be, they are not ends in themselves.

Again, Dr Walshe, at the conclusion of his Linacre Lecture to the Fellows of St John's College, Cambridge, said: 'The practice of medicine flourishes most when doctors remember that prudence governs the employment of science, and that in the last resort they are concerned with the ultimate particular thing, the human person, whom science by itself is inadequate to comprehend.'

In these and in other passages which I could quote, I discern a feeling that is humble and expectant, a desire for the help that must come from those who are searching for truth and healing in a different category of human experience, help such as the Christian religion should be able to provide.

This is a new outlook in medicine. When I began medical practice, the idea that the mind and spirit had any real effect upon health or disease was not seriously entertained, and one still comes across old fashioned people who think like that.

Some time ago I had to treat a professor—a Senior Wrangler—whose faith in anything physical, in a pill or a potion, was almost pathetic; but when I suggested that his trouble might be due to a wrong mental attitude, he was quite incredulous and looked at me as if he thought I had mistaken my profession. But that is passing rapidly.

Frequently we meet with those who go to the other extreme and think that all disease is purely mental in origin, and who do not approve of any remedy of a physical nature. This sometimes leads to strange conclusions. When I offered a prescription to one lady, she said firmly: 'No. I never take drugs. If I have indigestion, I just take some bicarbonate of soda, a little sal volatile and ten drops of tincture of ginger!'

But we must not overlook the difficulties. The fact is that when it comes to

actual practice, the religious and the scientific points of view are very different and even seem to conflict. A few years ago in the columns of the *Lancet* a very interesting correspondence took place. Professor Platt, the well-known orthopaedic surgeon in Manchester, writing on 'The Doctor's Creed', in reply to an address which had been given by the Archbishop of Canterbury, said that while he accepted the Christian ethic, he could not accept Christian doctrine—he had seen too many children die of nephritis to believe that God could be both good and all-powerful.

It was interesting to note that his letter was followed by a flood of correspondence from other doctors—in all branches of medicine—dissociating themselves from this conclusion and pointing out that Christianity without Christ was both illogical and impossible. They recognized that the problem of goodness is just as great as that of evil; that Professor Platt, demanding a high ethic and refusing any Deity who was not good, was himself a problem as great as the evil and suffering of the world which he deplored. The doctors were on the side of the angels and the Archbishop! But what I failed to notice was any attempt to show the necessity of religion in actual medical practice. They seemed content to keep their science in one compartment of life and their religion in another. This is not Christianity. Religion is not *a* duty, but something which has to do with *all* duties. 'To spiritualize what is material, to Christianize what is secular—this is the noble achievement of Christian principle.'

The Churches' Council of Healing, is an inter-denominational council of doctors, clergy, and laymen which seeks to provide a common basis for the healing movements which stand on Christian foundations, and to afford a recognized basis for the co-operation of doctors and clergy in the study and performance of their respective functions in the work of healing. It is a federating body seeking to support and unite the various guilds which for some time now have been concerned both with health and healing, and to bring all these into closer relation with the work of the Church. The Council has won the support of the British Medical Association, who have appointed representatives to serve on its Executive. This is a notable, I would say historic event. It means that there is a recognition on the part of the medical profession that for the work of healing, faith and reason must go hand in hand; that the whole nature of man—body, mind, and spirit—must be evoked if health in the full sense of the word is to be attained and maintained.

Now, if health is wholeness—the functional unity of the organism and of personality—there must be some unifying factor to bring it about, to hold together the elements in our nature which otherwise might be contradictory rather than complementary. All healthy life grows out from a centre in its being. In the case of man, I discover this in what we call the soul, for this is the link between the spiritual and the physical aspects of our nature. St Augustine described it well when he said that in respect of the material life the soul is the receptacle of impressions from without, but in respect of the spiritual it is a conduit of the eternal grace.

Psychology is the science of the soul. If we think of it today rather as the science of the mind, or of mental behaviour, then the whole mind must be taken into account—the conscious, the sub-conscious and the super-conscious. When

we are referring to all these, there is much to be said for retaining the term soul as a better description of what we mean. It is here that the diverse interests of flesh and spirit meet and influence each other. If for any reason this link is lost or weakened, there is no through way for the forces of the spirit to reach the body, and that must spell weakness; the clutch has been put out and the drive is lost. This can go so far as to produce an actual split in consciousness, which we call schizophrenia. Short of that, there may be anxiety, fear, and all the mental and physical effects which result from this. These are the cases where shock therapy is sometimes employed, and it can be helpful; but it is obvious that it is of little use shocking or pulling a person together into a state of reality if he cannot stay there.

Our Lord attached the greatest importance to the value of the human soul. 'What shall it profit a man if he gains the whole world and lose his own soul.' It is in the soul says Maeterlinck that the great things happen. Here are born those intuitions which we have for that which is good and true and lovely; here we come into touch with that which is real. The soul seems to have a magnetic power drawing to itself what it needs from the world outside, and giving what is in its nature to give.

Earlier in this article I mentioned the universal urge that there is in living things to express their instincts and faculties according to their particular nature, seeking a fuller life beyond. This is essential to health and applies both to our physical and spiritual nature. But it is just here that we come up against a fact which must be taken into account; it is the fact of evil, the fact that something has gone wrong with our human nature, that it is no longer as natural as it is natural to be. 'A baffling and perverting carnal mesh binds the soul and makes all error.' And so we find Berdyaev, the Russian philosopher, describing man as a being who is polarized in the highest degree, a contradictory being, God-like and beast-like, free and enslaved, capable of great love and sacrifice capable also of great cruelty and unlimited egoism. It is because he cannot resolve this conflict that he is afraid—afraid of the evil and afraid also of the good, of the devil and also of God.

If this description be true, is there not need for spiritual healing? Must man not be healed in his soul if he is to be healed in his body and spirit? The psychiatrist spends much of his time going to the cause of his patient's difficulty, believing that if he can discover this, the patient will himself be able to deal with it. There is a measure of truth in that, because knowledge increases our opportunity of deriving profit from our own thought and exertion; but at the best it is often a half-truth. We may know very well the cause of our trouble and yet be unable to deal with it. What we really need is a power to overcome it, to do the hard, uninteresting duty, to defeat the degrading fear or resentment.

This is not just the problem of the neurotic; it is the problem of the human race. Who has not deplored at times the ineffectiveness of the human intellect to do, not only what it ought to do, but what it really wants to do? Like the Apostle, the patient sees a law in his members warring against the law of his mind, and bringing him into captivity. 'I know that this fear of mine is wrong and stupid, and I hate and despise it; but it defeats me every time.' Who in some measure cannot endorse that patient's statement? And often it is the very irrationality of the fear or the folly which is so devastating.

The Christian solution is that alongside this fact of sin and evil comes the fact of God, not only to forgive, but to heal. When man finds that he is forgiven, he is aware also that he is being healed. In Christ we have reason to expect both—that God who 'forgiveth all our iniquities, healeth all our diseases'.

In our day there is apparent a notable increase in mental and nervous disorders, many of them of a purely functional character, but none the less distressing and serious on that account. Many drugs are being put on the medical market with a view to putting a barrier between the patient and the source of his worries, anxieties, and obsessions. This may have a real value in certain cases, but to be incapable of pain or anxiety would itself be a serious disorder. We should rise above anxiety, not fall below it. When the Apostle, writing to the Philippians, said, 'In nothing be anxious,' he preceded that advice by saying, 'The Lord is at hand'. Apart from that, it would have been a very trite remark. To meet the thousand shocks that flesh is heir to, both from without and from within, God is needed.

It is certainly easier in many ways to keep our science and religion apart, but the healing of the sick and the preaching of the gospel must go together. There are spiritual healers who are concerned to revive the ministry of healing as it was in the early days of the Church. This is impossible; we must go forward, recognizing all that we have learnt since those early days, and being led by the spirit of truth into all that awaits us in the future. The Church cannot ignore the advance of science, physical and mental. It is no less true that a purely intellectual approach to the problem of suffering must fail. The influence of the spiritual upon the mental is quite as necessary as that of the mind upon the body.

As a doctor I have dealt mainly with the human side of our subject. There is this side to it; without the effort of the patient or of his friends—whatever means have been employed—we cannot envisage Spiritual healing. But this is not the only aspect of the matter, nor is it the most important. We may try too little, but we may try too much, and in this way put a check upon the movement of the Divine. Who has not noticed that often it was when he came to the end of his own resources and was on the brink of despair, when he had no choice but to throw himself without reserve upon the grace and healing power of God, that something was done for him which he could never have done for himself? The door seemed to open of its own accord.

It seems as if a transference of thought and feeling and will must take place before that greater flow from the Divine to the human can occur. Then healing happens—something a doctor can observe but can never explain, for its reality is to be discovered not in the body, nor in the mind, but in the Spirit, in that which never was on land or sea, but which once moved on the face of the waters, creating both mind and body, making all things new.

J. BURNETT RAE

HEALING THROUGH MEDITATION

THERE ARE various methods of meditation practised by those who are concerned with the ministry of healing. In this article I am confining myself to one particular method, known as *Contemplative Meditation*. Although used in past centuries by devout men and women who followed the life of contemplation and prayer, it was a certain Dr Porter Mills of the United States who developed this particular method in the last century. His teaching has been carried on in this country by a number of people, and in particular by Miss Marian Dunlop, who with others has formed a Fellowship of Meditation with its headquarters at 3 Longdown, Guildford, Surrey. It is to her writings that I am indebted for what follows in this article.

In essence, contemplative meditation is entering into communion with the Holy God. Two main beliefs lie behind the practice of it. First, that the Holy Spirit of God dwells within us and is ever present with us. Secondly, that we are so made by God that we can consciously become more and more aware of that Holy Presence within and about us. Therefore the aim of contemplative meditation is to awaken, quicken, and deepen our knowledge of the divine Spirit at work within us at all levels of our consciousness.

It is important to distinguish between contemplative and discursive meditation. In the latter method, familiar to all who study their Bibles, we seek, through the controlled use of the imaginative faculty and the intellect, to make real some passage of Scripture, so that by pondering on it we may take forth its message into daily life through some act of the will or some Christian activity. But in contemplative meditation, apart from the study of its theory and any preparatory reading we may do *before* beginning to meditate, we have to learn to lay down the intellect, so that we may enter into the deeper realm of the Spirit. Both methods have their part to play in a Christian's training, but it is only with the former method that we are now concerned.

In contemplative meditation we fix the mind on some aspect of the divine activity embodied in words that express to us the character and being of God. Such words are Holiness, Truth, Wisdom, Love, Beauty, Peace, Joy, Grace, Light, Life, Righteousness and Goodness. Any such word of divine activity before which the great proclamation 'I AM' can be placed is suitable for using in an act of contemplative meditation. These great Words of Life do not denote something which God *has*; they seek to indicate, as far as human language can, what He *is* in His divine being as He discloses it to our finite minds. In a sense, therefore, each Word of Life, for the very reason that it can be preceded by the divine title 'I AM', must necessarily include deep within the core of its inner meaning all the other Words of Life by means of which we train ourselves to deepen our experience of the richness of the fullness of the Godhead. Therefore every time we come to meditate, we should pause to remember that whatever the focal word of the sentence we are using, we are in very truth preparing to come into communion with God Himself, the *whole* of the 'I AM'. Yet because the whole is too overwhelmingly great for our finite minds to dwell on in any one period of silence, we needs must seek to receive knowledge of

only one of its aspects at a time, although by so doing the other qualities of His being are not excluded from our experience of communion with Him. Most of those who practice contemplative meditation find it easier to 'stay the mind' upon a sentence rather than upon a single word—for example, upon Christ's saying, 'My peace I give unto thee', rather than upon the single word 'peace'. Such sentences used for meditation are either chosen from or based on, the words of Scripture—often they are words spoken by Christ.

The following are a few of the sentences for meditation used in the Fellowship of Meditation:

1. 'Be still and know that I AM Peace within thee' (based on Ps. 46₁₀).
2. 'I am come, that you may have Life, and have it more abundantly' (based on John 10₁₀).
3. 'I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of My Righteousness' (Isa. 41₁₀).
4. 'The Joy of the Lord is my strength' (based on Neh. 8₁₀).
5. 'That I may know the riches of Thy Grace' (based on Eph. 2₁₋₈).

In the practice of contemplative meditation there are three conditions to be fulfilled, if we are to enter as fully as possible into the divine presence.

1. We must learn to relax physically, so that our body may express the Peace of God. We must then turn the mind away from the thoughts that have been filling it and centre the attention on the sentence chosen for meditation.

2. We must aim at being receivers of Divine Power, Peace and Love, and refrain from projecting our own thoughts and ideas into the great Words of Life.

3. 'The words of the meditation should be repeated slowly, with gentle intentness; expectantly confident that "He willeth to be known"; without irritation when other thoughts try to insinuate themselves; till at length the need for repetition no longer exists, because our latent power of response to the truth contained within the words has been awakened, and the silence becomes lit with the knowledge of Immanuel, God with us'. (*Silent Night*, by M. V. Dunlop, p. 6). The author of this quotation continues:

It is important to stress that in this method of meditation, the unbroken use of repetition throughout the time of silence is not required. The repetition is simply to enable us to come into full and silent communion with God; once that communion is established, the need for repetition no longer exists. The mind is held by the words and the heart is absorbed in receiving from God the Divine Feeling, Peace or Love or Goodness, for which the sentence stands. It is at this stage that meditation proper begins. It would help us to reach this stage, if, after a few minutes, we were to repeat the words more and more slowly; there seems to come, as it were, a break in which the words are no longer needed, at least for a few minutes or even seconds. But this stage of 'holding the silence' cannot be artificially induced, and we must be content to 'wait on the Lord' until it is given to us, and be ready to return happily to the repetition of the words should other thoughts intrude.

For those beginning it is wise not to attempt to meditate for more than a few minutes at a time daily.

The phrase 'transmutation of consciousness' is often found in books which deal with the subject of contemplative meditation. If we believe that the divine

love is always at work within us at all levels of consciousness, then we must expect that if we meditate sufficiently deeply, our whole life—soul, mind and body—will be 'transmuted' by the creative life of God. This, surely, is what St Paul meant in Romans 12: 'Be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind.'

It is sin which has come to spoil the divine in each of us. Centuries of fear, distrust, bitterness, and all those other negative emotions which are deeply-rooted within us, have left their mark upon our natures, not to mention the daily falling away from the life of grace; so that in our own strength we cannot become what we could wish to become, men and women radiating God's peace and life and joy. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* interprets the word 'consciousness' as the 'totality of a person's thoughts and feelings'. All our past thoughts and experiences, our reactions to our past environment in babyhood, schooldays, and adult life, have made us what we are now on the human level. The more we centre our minds on material thoughts alone, the more materially-minded we shall become; but the more we give our minds to the thoughts of the spiritual world (and contemplative meditation helps us to do this) the more will our whole consciousness become transmuted, renewed and remade. By constantly dwelling on the divine thoughts of life and love, joy and peace, we shall gradually learn to 'lay down' the old life, with its moods and fears, its anxieties and resentments, and to take up the new life, which St Paul called 'putting on the Christ'.

As we progress in the practice of contemplative Meditation, our 'subconscious' mind will become more deeply penetrated by the divine gifts of love and peace. It is this 'subconscious' mind which, through the involuntary nervous system, controls our bodily functions; therefore the more deeply we learn to meditate, the more will our whole consciousness become healed on the three levels of our present existence, spiritual, mental and physical. Not only will our lesser ailments become healed through meditation, but also the more deep-seated diseases, both nervous and organic, which have their roots in the mind and the soul. We can now go on to see how we can bring healing through meditation to others.

In one of her papers on meditation and healing, Miss Dunlop has written these words: 'No one person is an independent unit . . . ; there is continual interpenetration of consciousness, not only through the willed contacts of speech on the level of conscious thought, but also, and perhaps more potently, at the level of subconscious feeling'. It is this 'unity of consciousness' which draws us together, not only as members of the human race, but also in a much deeper way as members of Christ's Body; because we are 'the body of Christ, and severally members thereof' (1 Cor. 12₂₇) we are 'members one of another' (Eph. 4₂₅). The help given to the sick does not depend only on those who minister through physical means, valuable as that help must clearly be; but since man is composed not merely as a physical being, but of soul, mind and body, Divine Healing depends on healing power being released on the deeper level of the spirit. Contemplative meditation is one way in which that healing power can be released for the making whole of men and women in soul, mind and body.

We need to accept in a really living way the conception that Health is one of

the names of God by which He makes Himself known to us—Health, Wholeness, Holiness. Therefore as God never withdraws Himself from man, the Health which He *is* must be always with us. Health for soul, mind and body is the outcome of conscious union with the Spirit of Holiness within, that is the Health which we desire for those for whom we meditate.

Before we attempt to bring healing to others through meditation, we must get free from all negative feelings by using some such meditation as the following: 'I will heal thy soul of ignorant desire; I will heal thy heart of ignorant emotion; I will heal thy mind of ignorant thinking; I will heal thy body of ignorant sensation; I will make thee whole.'

It may be necessary to hold these words in our minds for some minutes, before we are ready to lift up the name of a sufferer for healing. We can be of most help to him by first ridding our own consciousness of all negative emotion; so doing necessitates some previous practice in meditation.

When we are deep enough into our time of meditation, we then bring the name of the sufferer into the meditation by just lifting him up for a moment into the *Healing Love*, and then going on with our meditation, assured that because we are both linked together on the deeper level of Spirit, therefore the indwelling Spirit of Love is at work within us both, and we can trust the sufferer completely to the Healing Love. When we lift up a sufferer into our healing meditation, particularly one who is very ill or very closely associated with us, we must be very careful not to dwell on the details of his disease, or we shall get swamped by negative feelings and not able to help him at all. In fact we may do just the opposite and affect him adversely, or, worse still, try to *will* healing into him by *our own efforts*, because of our intense desire to bring him healing. All we are attempting to do when we meditate for another is to be in that same state ourselves that we desire for him. We must leave the rest to God. If we are in His Peace, then those we lift up, who are a 'part' of our consciousness, are also in His Love and Peace.

I should like to pass on what Miss Dunlop says on meditation and healing.

Suppose you are desirous of meditating on behalf of someone who is ill. Your desire in its elementary stage will probably be no more than a wish that the sufferer may get physically well; and you may hope that your wish may somehow be re-inforced by the Power of God. But when you have practised sufficiently often to grasp that the object of meditation is to enable us to receive the Life which Christ *is*, so that His Peace and Wisdom and Love may reign in our hearts, then that acceptance of His Life is what you desire supremely for yourself and the other.

All the theories—which we should study and investigate at other times—about our mental states affecting our bodily conditions fade temporarily into the background. The knowledge that physical healing may rightly be expected as an accompaniment of our communion with Him who is Eternal Life holds, indeed, a place in the mind during our meditation, but it is no longer central. In a deeply Healing Meditation we are not aware of any desire other than to know the illuminating peace of union with God.

The following meditations are particularly suitable for use when meditating for those in need. 'Spirit of Love that dwells within me, that knows and heals and overcomes all evil, I will trust myself to thee for wholeness, healing and peace.' 'Let Thy love be an illuminating and healing power within me.'

In this article, which of necessity can only give a brief summary of what is involved in contemplative meditation, I have tried to give the main teaching which underlies it. But it is only in the regular and faithful *practice* of meditation that we shall be able to enter into the joy of communion with the Holy God.

To make one final quotation from the writings of Miss Dunlop:

Meditation is to enable us to live in the full stream of the Life of God—'to have Christ formed in us'. At a time when human beings are threatening to inflict unimaginable misery upon each other (which does not only involve physical suffering) through the use of nuclear weapons, it is surely impossible to over-emphasise man's present need of God. Followers of Christ should surely by all means in their power seek to bring His Saving Health into the world. In contemplative meditation we do so by offering our whole consciousness to Him, to be cleansed and healed and used for His Purposes of Love in the world.

P. H. W. GRUBB

INTERCESSION AND HEALING

IN WHAT follows, it is not my purpose to chronicle strange healings which bring evidence of answer to intercession, but to indicate a Christian approach to the matter. The Christian tries to understand life from within religion, and therefore he must understand healing in the same way. What distinguishes the believer from the unbeliever is the depth that he finds in life. For the believer everything runs back to the ultimate mystery which is God Himself, and he believes that Christ has given him understanding of the nature of that mystery. The believer may be a scientist, but he is a believer because he is aware of reaches of life which lie beyond science. His characteristic is that he understands all things in God. Thus he does not merely assess healing scientifically. He understands healing ultimately from the Ultimate Mystery, which is God Himself.

This does not cancel the believer's science. He knows that God can work in many ways, in ways that are within our understanding and ways that are beyond it. He does not think that an event must be beyond our understanding for it to be an act of God. Thus he does not make intercession a substitute for

all other methods of healing. He is not a superstitious person. His characteristic is not that he is against science, but that he sees science, as all other things, in God. He knows that prayer can permeate the use of science, and that science itself moves in a mystery which it is not its business to elucidate. He is aware that God can achieve things for those who trust Him, things which perhaps cannot be explained from a purely scientific rationality. The resources of science are not the only resources at the disposal of the Christian, but the Christian is not anti-scientific. He sees the scientific method of healing as a gift from God. Any stressing of intercessory prayer in a proud exaltation which despises science and looks down upon it as the arm of flesh is a refusal to see the whole of life in God. The Christian spirit can permeate the scientist; the Christian surgeon or psychiatrist is aware of depths beyond those which his scientific technique can help him to understand.

The believer is aware of God by faith. Overwhelming proof would kill this relation of faith. What has been proved beyond all manner of doubt cannot be a matter of trust. Thus the Christian should not expect from intercessory prayer such certain and compulsive evidences that no man can possibly doubt. Attempts are often made to provide statistics and proofs which will show beyond any manner of doubting that intercessory prayer can do things which science can not, but whatever we adduce in the way of proof will always be assessed in another way by scientific men. There is always the possibility of a scientific explanation of any event, as well as that which religion gives. What is regarded as miraculous divine intervention may be, perhaps, when knowledge is further advanced, explained quite simply along rational or psychological lines. There never will be any proof of the power of intercessory prayer which will convince a scientist who does not acknowledge the mysterious depth of things. Too much time is wasted trying to prove the power of intercessory prayer to some kind of medical unbeliever.

Religion means seeing the whole of life in the Divine Mystery, and if a man has no sense of that, he is not likely to understand the things of religion and the way in which God deals with His folk in special mercies. To attempt to find compulsive proof of the reality of intercessory prayer by the massing of statistics, the describing of cures, and so on is nothing less than to try to prove the reality of miracle. It is impossible to prove that a miracle is a miracle. At least, it is impossible to prove that a scientific explanation of the event will not be forthcoming some day. It may be questioned whether the description of miracle as a breaking of the laws of nature is specifically Christian. The characteristic of the Christian notion of miracle is that the believer feels that in a particular event something surprising and unexpected was done for him by God, which no human power could have foretold. He finds in a miracle a special providence of God for himself; something has happened which has raised him into a new level of life. It is not specifically Christian to be distressed by the fact that such an event should be capable of scientific interpretation. The idea of hard and fast laws of nature did not emerge until the eighteenth century and certainly the early Church did not think in terms of such laws being contravened by the direct action of God. To the man of the early Church the emergence of the plant from the seed was a direct revelation of the power of God; it was analogous to Resurrection. The process was not regarded in a scientific manner as it is

today. The New Testament man saw in what we call miracle, not so much a contravention of the laws of nature, as a special act of God in mercy and help to a particular person, lifting him into a state which he could never have expected. Thus on beholding a miracle he does not cry out that the laws of nature have been broken, but rather that he has 'never seen it on this wise'; and he goes away rejoicing for the special grace that God has given to men.

Far too much talk about intercessory prayer has been conditioned by an unconscious argument with a sceptical scientist, as though the whole thing had to be hammered out in relation to him. A healing may on one level be capable of scientific interpretation, especially after the event; but the believer knows and feels it to be a special mercy of God to him, which has changed his life and lifted him to another condition. The scientific interpretation is not really relevant to this. To believe in intercessory prayer is not to return to a pre-scientific universe. It is to see life in those depths in which it is touched by God. This takes the believer into a dimension which is beyond science. The scientist can neither prove nor disprove the existence of this dimension. Our attitude towards this question should not be a continual fight with presumed scepticism, an uneasy search for some evidential stick with which to deal a knockout blow to the sceptic, but rather a *credo ut intellegam*, a concentration on understanding prayer and the spheres in which the Christian experiences its power.

When we stress that the Christian seeks most of all the breakthrough into a new life, we are coming to the essentially Christian element in prayer. Undoubtedly petition is a part of prayer, and we are told in the New Testament to make our requests known to God. Nevertheless, what the Christian is taught to seek is primarily the Kingdom of God, to be in Christ, to find eternal life. We must realize that the prayerful attitude, or wrestling in prayer, is something deeper than the devotional exercise. It is an emotional attitude which emerges whenever it is necessary for life to break through to a deeper level, whenever life is trying to penetrate a sphere which until that moment was inaccessible to it. There is a kind of prayer in the first feeble toss of a fish from the sea, which is answered when its successors are able to fly; suddenly a barrier breaks and life is on another level. This happens during psychotherapeutic analysis. The patient is found to be imprisoned in a notion of himself which has become habitual and which life has encouraged him to regard as actually himself; it is the cause of his sickness. There is a tough moment in analysis when the patient comes to see that his attitude and condition are wrong, and yet knows no means by which he can break out of himself; the releasing moment appears when suddenly the new attitude which his feebleness or ignorance was unable to reach, and which seemed to be resisting his puny effort to climb to it, comes as it were of itself. But before that happens there is a time of seeking and stress, a wrestling to achieve another life. The patient must persist, and the analyst too, although it appears to them that the patient is irrevocably closed in.

This kind of experience illumines the insistence of the New Testament on persistence in prayer, and our Lord's words: 'Knock and it shall be opened unto you.' The specifically Christian emphasis is on this power of prayer to achieve a new life, to bring about an action of God which changes the whole human condition. It is this new condition that is primarily sought in prayer.

In the Lord's Prayer, there is indeed a petition for some of the goods of this life, for that food without which life cannot continue; but the rest of the prayer is concerned with a new kind of life, the coming of God's Kingdom, the fulfilling of His will, the release from the effects of sin and the power of evil. In the Johannine teaching, the stress is on prayer in the name of Jesus, that is, prayer that is according to His will and spirit, and this teaching presupposes the search for new life. In St Luke's Gospel, the reward promised to those who persist in prayer is that God will give them His Spirit. Behind the simplicity of the parables which speak of a poor widow importuning an unjust judge and a friend coming at midnight to rouse his neighbour, there is the same implication. In both it is a case of a break through to the satisfaction of what these people conceived to be their most pressing need, a release in order that life should go on freely. In the New Testament the chief purpose of prayer is to release from hindrances, and to break through into a new condition.

Therefore the business of prayer for the sick is to move the whole being of the person prayed for into another condition. This condition is one of openness to God. We know this to be certainly the case when we are praying for someone's conversion. We are praying that he should be put right in relation to deep factors of life which he deliberately ignores or does not know, and in particular that he should be put right with God. But we are not always so clear about the sick person, and this because in many cases we lack sympathy and understanding of what the afflicted person is really passing through. If he is a believer, he will certainly pray for himself, but in conditions of grave bodily or mental illness this becomes very difficult. He may be too weak, his mind may be confused, or he may be in too much pain. If his illness is emotional, the problem is increased. Thus it is necessary that others should undertake prayer for him. The purpose of their prayer is to bring his whole condition before God. They are anxious that something new shall happen to him—it may be to his body, his emotions or his spirit—something new of which the need is very apparent, which he is not able to achieve for himself, and which medical science can only help him to achieve in a limited degree.

Illness tends to isolate and imprison the human soul; thus a sick man needs to find a fundamental release from his prison. It is now being increasingly realized by medicine that healing has to do with the whole man; thus it is the man as a person, in his integrity, who needs to find this release. Things which affect the spirit and the emotions tend to reveal themselves in bodily conditions also; and diseases which are primarily physical in nature have their reaction on the emotions. But the old division of man into body, soul and spirit, still retains its significance, although man is an indissoluble whole. The condition of bodily pain or weakness affects the emotions, and these in their turn put a severe strain on the spiritual aspect of man, on his faith in God and his power of resting in Him. Or to put it the other way round, a man may be spiritually awry in his illness, either because he bitterly resents the fact that God has permitted him to have it, or because he has a sense that it is a punishment for some sin that he knows he has committed, or because he has not faith with which to bear the strain that has come upon him. This will affect his whole emotional condition, and he may be full of fear or despair, or be very difficult as a patient, because of an irritability which has its origins in something beyond the actual

illness itself. It should be our first and foremost concern to have the person spiritually right with God. There is a will of God in every tribulation, and prayer should be offered first that the person may not be overwhelmed by the mystery of what is happening to him, but be able to discern that the love of God is abiding within that mystery. To show the sufferer that the love of God does so abide is often beyond the power of human speech and exhortation, and it is only a mysterious change of his spiritual attitude that can make it possible for him to realize it. This is the most important task, and it comes before the natural desire that the person should be healed. If this were recognized, we should not have so much talk about failure in intercession, about the fact that prayers for the healing of certain people have not been answered. When the person who has been prayed for dies, it is often thought that the intercession has been a failure. But the vital question is not why the person died when he had been prayed for, but how he died—whether he died in confident trust in God.

Prayer is not just a medicine that cures everyone when every known drug or method of surgery fails. Its primary purpose is to lift the person prayed for into unity with the love and the will of God. It is often assumed that the only aim of existence is health, and healing movements sometimes tend to talk as if it were. But experience has deep things to teach which transcend health, good and natural as the desire for it is; and the chief end of prayer is that a person should enter into a condition of rightness with God. Thus when we hear of an old woman who was a trouble to all about her simply because she would not accept the fact that she was near death, and who through intercessory prayer became a different person and died in the peace of God, then we should be, as Christians, as glad of that as if we had heard that she had got better in spite of all the doctors expected. If nothing changed in a grim situation except the attitude of one of the persons concerned in it, we should still hold that this was testimony to the power of intercession. Why must we always insist that the only proof of the efficacy of prayer for the sick is in some physical change? Have we no sense that the mysterious purposes of God are sometimes greater than considerations of life and health?

When we say that the primary purpose of prayer is to keep the person prayed for open to God—that is to say, to bring him to faith on a deeper level—we also at the same time imply that prayer can have curative effects on other levels too. For the human person is an indissoluble whole, and whatever happens to him will pass in some way through all the ranges of his being. In particular, we can say that it will have curative effects on his emotions. In emotional sickness, it is often true that something in the depth of the man is protesting against what he has made of himself, and against the course of his life. But this protest is not merely a negative thing; something new and salutary is struggling to be born in the depths of the man. The analyst who is helping him may be aware of this and may probe and suggest, and what can be done on the psychological level may be well done, and yet the patient may remain where he is, and the process of healing may seem to come to a standstill. What is lacking is a breath of new life, an impulse which will unite and heal the man within. But no analysis can produce this of itself. Prayer, as has been shown, deals with the depths from which such impulses can arise.

Most parsons and Christian psychiatrists can parallel the following. A woman

suffered from a maddening sleeplessness which was breaking her. Enquiries of a psychological kind revealed that she had a deep guilt complex, which clustered round an action which was really sinful, but which she had suppressed for years and seemingly forgotten. The unearthing of this through confession did some good, but the sleepless condition returned and persisted, until a prayer group took the matter in hand and the woman entered into an experience of forgiveness. In psychosomatic illnesses, the prayer that puts the person prayed for right at the deepest level must have a real if subtle curative effect. It was not a parson but two professors of psychosomatic medicine at Marburg University who declared that the chief factors in healing in this field were faith, hope, and love.

It might appear that in illnesses which are directly physical, prayer will be less manifest in its effects; but this does not follow. We do not fully understand the intimate relation between mind and body, or the ultimate nature of the factors that cause many diseases. Even in the case of an obvious accident, like that which has caused a broken leg, there sometimes still remains the question as to why the person is accident-prone, and this may be a spiritual problem. There is a mysterious depth in the human spirit which influences the decisions of doctors and the attitudes of patients. God moves in this depth and hears our prayers. There is an atmosphere in which healing is much easier, and this atmosphere can be created by prayer.

ERASTUS EVANS

GOTAMA BUDDHA

THE WORLD is celebrating, this year, the two thousand five hundredth anniversary of the death of Gotama Buddha. How are we to account for his profound influence upon his own generation, an influence which has persisted throughout all generations to the present time? He wrote no book. We do not possess a contemporary biography of him. Such a biography never existed. We are dependent for our knowledge of him almost entirely on the *Pitakas*, and more especially on the Pali *Pitakas*. But the earliest of these was written long after his death and the death of all his contemporaries, so that it is not easy to separate the hard core of fact from the accumulated exaggerations of later traditions.

Nevertheless, it is possible to gather from the records a fairly reliable outline of the facts of his life and some striking pictures of the man himself. We cannot in this short article, follow in detail the life of this great man, nor is it necessary, because the main facts are well known.

It will be enough to remind the reader that he was a man of noble family, and that he enjoyed every advantage of education and culture available in his country and age. Moreover, he was surrounded by those comforts and pleasures of life which are supposed to produce happiness. In point of fact, however, while still a youth, his mind appears to have become tinged with a gentle melancholy, which gradually deepened into a dark and gloomy pessimism.

This may be accounted for partly by the conditions of his daily life, but chiefly by the influence of the prevailing philosophy upon his mind and heart. Pessimism was widespread amongst the noble families of India in Gotama's days. The life they lived pallied upon them, and at a comparatively early age they became sated with physical pleasures. Moreover, for the most part, these 'sons of noble houses' had no serious duties, and there was little incentive or scope for ambition. Life ceased to provide new sensations, and they soon came to feel that it was sucked dry and worthless.

However, whilst all this is true, the real root from which sprang this bitter fruit of pessimism upon which Gotama and the men of his class fed, and by which their life and thought was poisoned, is to be found in the current philosophy of their age, in the terrible doctrines of *karma* and transmigration—the belief that all living beings are bound upon the 'wheel of life' from which there is no hope of escape, because, while they are working off their Karma (i.e. the results of deeds done in former lives) they are producing *fresh karma*, which will have to be suffered in future lives, and so on throughout eternity.

We are not surprised that men who accepted this philosophy regarded life as a great evil and a sorrow and misery without end. Enveloped in this atmosphere Gotama grew up, and we find him at the age of twenty-nine forsaking 'home' for 'homelessness'—leaving behind wife and child, father, friends, wealth, and ease—in the hope that somewhere and somehow he may find 'Deliverance' and bring suffering to an end.

His action was not unique; thousands of Indians had done and were doing the same, and this was, as we have suggested, especially true of the noble and

cultured. Therefore Gotama found himself in a great stream of men who were *seeking release from rebirth*.

While searching for a way of escape, he spent years in privations and tortures incredible, but all in vain. Every suggested means he tested, and rejected as worthless. Being weary and depressed, he sat down under the shade of a tree and began to take stock of his life. 'For,' said he, 'I have left all that men count dear in order to attain to this knowledge, and I have suffered all that man can suffer, and yet I seem no nearer to the goal of my desire. Would it not be wiser for me now to give up this fruitless search, and to return to my country and people where I am sure of a great welcome?' The temptation was very strong, but he resisted it, and he determined to continue his search for release, even though death should overtake him on the way.

With this thought in his mind he sat down under the shade of a great bo-tree, and resolved to remain seated there until he found either the way of escape from sorrow, or death. He is represented as meditating: 'Verily this world has fallen upon trouble, with its births, and ageing, and dying, and rebirths, and from this suffering no man knoweth a way of escape. Oh where shall a way out from this suffering, from decay and death, be made known?'

This was his problem, and he believed that he could solve it by profound meditation and self-conquest. He did not seek or expect help from any god or man, but relied upon his own unaided efforts for success. And we are told that after meeting all the temptations of Mara, and utterly defeating him, he finally attained to that knowledge, that enlightenment and illumination which made him the Buddha.

What was this supreme discovery that the Buddha made? It was the universal law of cause and effect, and the conception that in the universe there was neither God nor self (soul) nor *real* being, but only 'becoming', 'process'. This brought great joy to the heart of the Buddha, because he realized that if *soul* was not a *real entity*, but only a 'process', a 'becoming', part of the great world-process of arising and passing-away, then the soul *could* come to an end, i.e. cease to be, by the cutting-off of its cause.

The man who believes that the *self* he took to be *real* is only a shadow, a phantasm of the mind, has the assurance in his own heart: 'This is my last existence; when death comes it is the end of all. That man has attained Nirvana, the state of sorrowlessness.'

To others, the Buddha can do no more than point out the way; he cannot lend a hand to help them over the rough and difficult stages of the journey. 'Be ye yourselves your own refuge,' said he; 'the Buddhas are only teachers.' The Buddha came not as a 'saviour' of men, but as a guide to point out *the Way that leads from sorrow to sorrowlessness* by which they can save themselves.

In the most widely different periods of history, the notion of a revolution or change of the whole man in one moment meets us in many forms. In the Christian Church it is called 'conversion'—a moment for which men are consciously or unconsciously waiting and which is sufficient to give a new turn to their whole life.

The belief in a sudden illumination of the soul, in the fact of an internal emancipation perfecting itself in one moment, was universally prevalent in India; people looked for the 'deliverance from death', and told one another with

beaming countenance that the deliverance from death had been found. Whoever left his home and became a mendicant did so looking for the coveted fruit of enlightenment.

Undoubtedly, Gotama underwent a wonderful experience under the bo-tree. His age-long struggle was now over, the struggle which had involved him in ceaseless pain and sorrow. And with the ending of that struggle came the cessation of desire, sorrowlessness, rich peace, quietness, contentment, ineffable restfulness, and bliss.

Such is the picture of the Buddha sitting under the bo-tree. He is the Victor, the Enlightened One, the one alone above all gods and men. While he sat there enjoying the quietness and peace after the battle and struggle, he was tempted to keep the new knowledge to himself. He was discouraged at the thought of preaching his doctrine to men. How could men subject to the same temptations he had so keenly experienced, but lacking his power of self-mastery and invincible determination to conquer, understand his doctrine or tread the path that he had trodden?

But he was at last persuaded that there were a few men in the world who through ages of effort and self-culture had fitted themselves to receive and practise his doctrine. His meditation under the bo-tree gives us the true explanation. He says: 'I have penetrated this deep truth [the law of causality] which is difficult to understand . . . *which only the wise can grasp*'. His *Dhamma* was 'a deep truth', an intricate and difficult philosophy, which they alone could understand whose mental faculties had been so sharpened and polished that they could penetrate into its deep mysteries. The Buddha expected to find very few men of this mental calibre, and his experience confirmed his expectation.

In his first sermon at Benares, the Buddha himself says that for the sake of the *Dhamma*, 'the sons of noble families leave their homes and go into homelessness'. As a matter of historical fact, those early followers who gathered around the Buddha and became his personal disciples are usually described as 'the sons of noble houses'. Some of them belonged to the royal Sakyas, others were young Brahmins, or sons of merchant-princes; there were very few exceptions to this rule and their social position was assumed to have been due to the merit acquired in former lives. It is also implied that their education and intellectual attainments were in keeping with their social status. Such men as these, who had nothing more to hope from life when the 'cessation of becoming' was preached to them, accepted the doctrine gladly as a way of escape from an intolerable position. But it was no message of hope for the common people, and it had no meaning at all for the incalculable millions of sub-human living beings who were toiling painfully up the steep path that leads to birth as a human being.

The Buddha, having decided to preach his *Dhamma* to men, sought out first the five ascetics with whom he had practised austerities. He learnt that they were dwelling in the Deer Park in Benares. On the way he met Upaka, the Jain ascetic, who thus addressed him: 'Placid and serene is thy countenance. Who is thy teacher?' He replied: 'I have no teacher; there is none who resembles me. In the world of gods I have no equal; I am the most noble in the universe, being the irrefutable teacher, the sole all-perfect Buddha.' 'It may be so, friend; it may be so,' said the sceptical Upaka as he went on his way.

It has been suggested that a great religious teacher could not have spoken in this way. But the Buddha was quite sincere in his claims. He did not believe himself to be one great teacher amongst many, but the Supreme Teacher who had discovered the way of release from rebirth—the path leading to the extinction of pain. This position he maintained throughout his life. He had such confidence in himself and in his message that no questioning from friends or opponents could shake it.

His disciples accepted him at his own valuation, and so represented him to the public. This accounts largely for the success of his mission and the spread of his faith. The five ascetics accepted him and his teaching, the substance of which was the Four Sacred Truths of Suffering—namely, that (i) all existence involves suffering; (ii) suffering is caused by desire, especially the desire for continuance of existence; (iii) the extinction of desire will lead to the extinction of suffering; and (iv) the way to this end is the Noble Eight-fold Path. These four truths were the centre and heart of all his preaching to the end of his life. To him there appeared to be only one thing worth striving for—freedom from sorrow. That was his sacred goal.

We read that now there were six holy persons in the world—the Buddha and these five disciples. Very soon his disciples numbered sixty, and these he sent out to spread his gospel. The first Buddhist missionaries were filled with joy and conviction, and it seems clear that their preaching was eagerly welcomed. Amongst the early converts were the three brothers Kasyapa, Brahmins of Uruvela, with their hermit followers numbering 1,000.

The Buddha went to Rajagaha, the capital of Magadha, where he had a great reception, and won over two Brahmins, Sariputta and Moggallana, who eventually became the greatest of his disciples. We read that about this time the Buddha, at the earnest request of his father, visited Kapilavatthu, to the great joy of the Raja and his people. As a result, Siddhodana became a lay-adherent, and Rahula had his head shaved and joined the mendicant band of his father, the Buddha. Moreover, three of the Sakya princes, Ananda, Anuruddha, and Devadatta, his cousins, entered the Order, together with Upali, the royal barber, who afterwards became a great disciple.

The Buddha now returned to Rajagaha, where the rich merchant Anathapindika gave him the Jetavana Park at Savatthi, with its beautiful gardens, in which were 'residences for the brethren, houses, halls, storerooms, surrounded by lotus ponds, fragrant mango trees, shady arcades and leafy walks'. Here also was a 'fragrance chamber' for the Buddha's own use. King Bimbisara, too, gave to the Buddha his own pleasure garden called Veluvana (Bambu-grove). Similar gifts were given by a rich lady named Visakha, and by the famous courtesan, Ambipala; and there arose a keen rivalry between the chief towns for the honour of housing the Buddha and his monks.

The connected narrative of the Buddha's public ministry ends with the conversion of his two greatest disciples, Sariputta and Moggallana, and it is not taken up again until a period shortly before his death. In the long intervening ministry of more than forty years we have only a collection of undated and undatable incidents. As we read the *Pitakas*, however, we are impressed by the fact that the Buddha and his disciples lived their lives according to strict rules. One year, for them, was very much like every other year. They used to spend

about nine months of the year in wandering about the country, and the remaining three months of *Vassa*, the rainy season, in quiet retirement in the neighbourhood of towns and villages, where nobles and wealthy men contended for the honour of feeding them and providing for their other needs.

The Buddha himself usually spent the rainy season either at Rajagaha or Savatthi (Sahet Mahet). Moreover, it is probable that he did his most effective work in these great centres of population, and most of his recorded discourses are associated with either Rajagaha or Savatthi. But though we cannot follow the Buddha's history month by month and year by year, there has been preserved for us a very detailed account of his daily habits which we may accept with considerable confidence.

Rising very early in the morning, it was his habit, first of all, to accept water from his body-servant to rinse out his mouth, and afterwards to sit down and meditate until it was time for him to go begging. Then, taking his alms-bowl in hand, he went out into the town or village with eyes fixed on the ground, and passed silently from door to door, accepting whatever food was put into his bowl.

If he was invited to take his meal in a house, he usually accepted the invitation and ate whatever was put before him. The meal being over, he washed his hands, discoursed to those present on some interesting subject, and then returned to the place where he was staying at the time. After sitting quietly on one side while his disciples finished their meal, he retired to his chamber and allowed his body-servant to bring him water to wash his feet. This being done, he returned again to the assembly of the disciples, and addressed them on some point of doctrine or discipline.

The discourse being ended, he retired again to his fragrance chamber and rested through the heat of the day. Then, rising refreshed, he went out to welcome visitors, and, after receiving their gifts, he taught them such doctrines as he considered suitable for them. When the visitors had gone away, he would go to bathe at the bath-house or at some bathing tank or pond, and would afterwards retire to his chamber for further meditation.

When the evening was come, it was his custom to receive any of his disciples who had come to see him from a distance, give them counsel and advice, and send them away cheered and strengthened. The evening being now far advanced, and feeling cramped with so much sitting, the Buddha would spend some time in just pacing up and down to relieve his legs until it was time for him to retire to his room for the night. Though it must have been difficult to observe these rules whilst on his journeys, he seems to have kept them as far as possible.

As we read the *Pitakas*, we are impressed by the popularity of the Buddha and his doctrine. Wherever he went he was received with open arms by the nobles, and the common people as a rule followed their lead. How are we to explain this almost universal popularity?

He began his public work with great advantages. He belonged to the noble Sakya race and was the eldest son of a ruling prince. Therefore he met kings and nobles as an equal, and was accepted as one of themselves. Moreover, most of his followers were 'sons of noble houses', who would be welcomed everywhere. Besides, they formed part of the great religious popular movement,

the *Samana* movement. Religious mendicants were universally honoured in India. This was true not only of the Buddha's sect, but of all the other sects of *Samanas* as well.

But we must look for the chief reason of the Buddha's popularity to the impact of his personality upon the people. After his Enlightenment he was full of confidence in himself and his gospel of deliverance from rebirth. From every page stands out the strong, attractive personality of this teacher and winner of hearts.

His personal appearance was noble and commanding, and his voice had some special quality which convinced the hearers by its very tones. When such a man speaks, he influences the emotions and bends whoever listens to his will. Personal magnetism, and above all radiant confidence in the truth and reality of his message—these were the main elements of his success.

And in addition to all this, the men of his day were hungry for a way of finding peace and a way of escape from rebirth. Here was a teacher who claimed to have escaped from the things they feared and to be able to show men how to share his victory. It was the joyous confidence of this preacher which carried all before him. It was impossible for his hearers to doubt the truth of what he said while they listened to his eloquent tones and looked into his radiant face.

Men spoke of him in such terms as these: 'Behold him, the Exalted One, the bringer of joy, whose spirit is at rest, the supreme self-subduer and peace-possessor, the hero who has conquered self and watches himself, who holds his desires in check.'

Such was the man who won the hearts of the people amongst whom he moved, and who is still acknowledged as the Hero and the Master of millions today.

CHARLES H. S. WARD

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION AND EDUCATION TODAY

EDUCATION can never remain theoretical; it is essentially practical. At the same time, the methods used in the classroom reflect the teacher's philosophy of education. Quite often, educational theory is in advance of educational practice; that is to say, the methods used in the classroom do not reflect the noblest purposes conceived for education. The situation today is that we have failed to integrate the excellent methods now employed with the highest purposes that have been conceived. There is much that is excellent in educational theory and practice, but there is a lack of unity.

It is generally agreed that the basic question to be faced by all engaged in education is: 'What is man?' This is a question that can be answered only by the philosopher and theologian. The interpretation of the answer in the education of the child is the task of the teacher. So far as the Christian is concerned, the answer is plain. Spencer Leeson has stated this succinctly for all engaged in the task of education. 'We believe that human beings are the children of their Father in Heaven', he declares in his Bampton Lecture, 'and that the purpose of their life is, assisted by His redeeming grace, to become like Him. In the light of that simple but complete statement of the origin, duty, and destiny of man, our aim in education at once becomes clear, and the aim inspires the content and the method.' Our purpose is to examine the content and method of education today in the light of the Christian doctrine of man and his redemption.

This doctrine involves a belief that man is a child of God. That is to say, he has a divine origin. The last word about man is not spoken by the biologist or anthropologist. Man is neither a 'collocation of atoms' nor a developed species of the animal kingdom manifesting 'human' characteristics which have appeared in an evolutionary pattern. The creation of man was the deliberate purpose of God. Moreover, his origin determines his nature. Man is a spiritual being made for a life of obedience to and love for God. This spiritual relationship of obedience and love is marred by sin, and sin is a universal fact. The relationship between every man and God has been broken by sin, for 'all have sinned'. Nevertheless, that relationship can be restored and maintained by the redeeming grace of God. The imperative need of every man is redemption. When that has been effected man is in the way to fulfil his destiny, which is to come at length to that perfect spiritual relationship of obedience and love to God, which transcends the present and is perpetuated in the eternal.

The acceptance of the Christian doctrine as the truth about man would have far-reaching implications in educational practice. Indeed, wherever this conception has been recognized as the inspiring purpose, it has transformed the content and method of education. This may be seen from a study of certain aspects of education in England.

WESLEY AND EDUCATION IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Until the eighteenth century, education was not taken seriously in England. In so far as there was any education at all it was influenced by three factors. First, the wide gulf which existed between the privileged and unprivileged. Education

was the mark of privilege, ignorance the mark of poverty. Secondly, no attempt was made to relate education to the child. Thirdly, moral and religious education, in so far as it existed, was based on code and precept.

That these three factors no longer exercise the influence they did is due to the impact of great educational, social, and religious thinkers. In many popular histories of education the chief credit for this revolution is given to educationists such as Rousseau (1712-78) and Pestalozzi (1746-1827), and social and political reformers such as Adam Smith (1723-90), Thomas Paine (1737-1809), and T. R. Malthus (1766-1834). But much of the credit for this revolution of thought and practice in the sphere of education, as in so many other spheres, is due to John Wesley, whose life almost spanned the eighteenth century (1703-91).

John Wesley was not primarily an educationist. He was an evangelist. It was his evangelism that made him an educationist. 'You have nothing to do but save souls,' he told his preachers. 'Therefore spend and be spent in this service and go not only to those who want you, but to those who want you most.' For the first time for centuries the poor had the Gospel preached to them. Even 'outcasts of men . . . harlots, and publicans and thieves' were invited to share the riches of God's grace; to have a new dignity conferred upon them. The eighteenth century was made vividly aware of the value of each man in the sight of God. Rousseau and Pestalozzi did not derive their inspiration from Wesley, but many of their ideas would have fallen on barren ground in England had not John Wesley gone before them with his gospel.

The three factors mentioned earlier as the bar to progress in education before the eighteenth century were incompatible with the gospel Wesley preached. If Wesley's insistence on the gospel of grace was true, then it was inconceivable that there should exist a gulf between the privileged and unprivileged, that education should be for the few when the gospel was for all. Again, it was incompatible with the gospel that the child should have no value for its own sake. Moreover, Wesley's emphasis on experiential religion was a protest against a morality of code and precept.

These are implications of the evangelical witness, but Wesley was essentially a practical man. No sooner did he see a practical implication of his gospel than he sought to give expression to it. It is not surprising, therefore, that there should appear a Methodist experiment in education. John Wesley was critical of the boarding schools of his day. His answer was to found Kingswood School. This was an interesting experiment. In the first place, it gave the unprivileged the benefits of a boarding school education, which hitherto had been reserved for the well-to-do. In the second place, the overruling purpose was 'Christian education'. In the third place, it sought to relate education to the needs of the child. Although harsh things have been said about the Spartan regulations of Kingswood, and of Wesley's attitude to sport, Kingswood School was a very real attempt to give expression to the Christian doctrine of man in the sphere of education. The extension of Methodist education into the sphere of primary education was another expression of this same doctrine.

It would be untrue to say that Wesley alone brought about the revolution in education. There were, as has been mentioned, others who have made a

signal contribution to this period of progress. What Wesley did was to make evident the Christian doctrine of man, which alone is the true basis of education. We can see now how the seed of new educational theories fell on good ground and grew and multiplied.

NEW THEORIES OF EDUCATION

Special mention must be made of Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-78). His best-known work is *Emile*, which was published in 1762. In many respects it is a strange book. John Wesley records in his *Journal* for 3rd February 1770: 'I read with much expectation a celebrated book—Rousseau upon Education [i.e. *Emile*]. But how was I disappointed! Sure a more consummate coxcomb never saw the sun.' He proceeds in characteristic style to a hostile and, one must say, an unreasonable criticism of the book. Wesley was living too near to Rousseau to appreciate the contribution this man was making to the whole future of education. It is true, as Professor H. C. Barnard points out (*Short History of Education*, p. 40), that *Emile* is 'full of exaggerations, inconsistencies and paradoxes', but the very provocative nature of the book called attention to the need for far-reaching reforms in education. Most important of all, Barnard declares, it was Rousseau who 'set it finally beyond question that education must accommodate itself to the child, and that the child must not be accommodated to a pre-determined adult system of education'. It will be seen that such a conviction was complementary to the Christian conception of man.

The ideas of Rousseau were modified and popularized by another educational thinker, the Swiss, Pestalozzi (1746-1827). He was a practising teacher and his schools at Stans and Yverdon attracted much attention. His best-known works are *Leonard and Gertrude* and *How Gertrude Teaches Her Children*. In these he sets forth his belief that the task of education is to assist 'nature's march of development', so as to secure a natural, symmetrical, and harmonious progress. He goes beyond Rousseau in the importance he attaches to religion. He believes that man has a divine origin and end, but he has a suspicion of precepts and codes which are unnatural to the experience of the child. He strove to arouse the sentiment of each virtue before pronouncing its name. Believing that morality could best be learned from the social relationships of the home, he did his utmost to reproduce the atmosphere of the home in his schools.

It will be obvious that while there is no apparent connection between the work of Wesley on the one hand and Rousseau and Pestalozzi on the other, the two influences they represent have together changed the content and method of education to a very marked degree. They gave birth to that conception of education which puts the child in the centre and the reconstruction of experience before formal instruction. This healthier and homelier attitude to education, when linked up with the Christian conception of our nature and destiny and accepted by all engaged in the task of education, cannot fail to transform the character of a nation.

THE PRACTICAL APPLICATION

It is in the classroom, however, that these purposes and theories have to be applied. Without the co-operation of the teacher, the highest purposes and noblest theories remain unrealized and unrelated.

The time-table of any school is not just a convenient method of arranging the school day; it reflects the basic assumptions upon which the educational system is founded. If education in the eighteenth century was determined by the three factors already mentioned, then education in the twentieth century has tended to be determined by the twin considerations, 'examinations' and 'specialization'.

Enough has been written of what Sir Richard Livingstone describes as 'the two dragons that stand across the path of true education'. There are many who do not see them as fearsome creatures. For our present discussion we must confine ourselves to the moral implications of these two factors.

Of examinations Livingstone says: 'Any evils that might follow the disappearance of examinations are nothing to the harm they do. They are, in fact, a refined form of the old and now universally condemned system of payment by results.' This system has had a long reign. It was introduced by the Newcastle Commission in 1761 as the basis upon which State grants would be supplemented by grants from county and borough rates. Professor Barnard comments upon this recommendation of the Commission: 'Thus was introduced the system of payment by results which hampered the development of English elementary education for many years to come.'

With some justification, the examination may be defended as one of the reliable means of assessing ability, of testing knowledge, and of creating an incentive to work. Our present purpose is to examine the examinations in the light of the Christian doctrine of man and that healthier conception of education which came to birth in the eighteenth century.

The examination system perpetuates a view of life which is untrue. Do you remember the results of the end-of-term examinations being posted up? First there appeared your name, so many subjects, and the marks attained in each; then, by an immoral bit of arithmetic, the marks were added together, divided by the number of subjects taken and the place in the form deduced. These facts appeared on the Report—number in the form, position in the form.

Life is not like that. It is not a series of subjects in which we have to pass. Life is a multiplicity of experiences. It is not static, but active. This fact was recognized by Professor Kandel in *The Report of the Consultative Committee on Secondary Education*: 'Subjects can have meaning only as they are treated as aspects of active and living human experience. Whether, if considered from this point of view, they can continue to be examinable in the traditional manner is at least open to question.'

There is need for us to discover ways of retaining the wholeness of life in education. In other words, education has to become a way of life, and not mere adherence to a time-table or achievement of a standard. This is an implication of the Christian doctrine of man when applied to an educational system which is dominated by the traditional examination system.

There is one other aspect of this matter that stands condemned by the Christian doctrine of man. This is the element of merit which goes hand in hand with the examination system. Only those who have suffered the sense of moral humiliation of failure in an examination can appreciate the frustration to body and soul that follows. There is no moral value in a facility to pass examinations, but too often such a value is placed upon it. Here is a point at which

parents might be educated not to place a halo about the head of little Willie, who is 'always top of his form', and reprove others who offer bicycles as incentives. One suspects that such parents are still suffering from the frustration of their own failures!

The other dragon which Sir Richard Livingstone saw across the path of education was 'specialization'. Of course, there is the need for a degree of specialization. Life is more specialized than it was and more special knowledge is needed to live it competently. At the same time, specialization has grave consequences. It limits knowledge and experience to what is beneficial and useful for some specific purpose. Too often this purpose is determined by materialistic considerations. The result is that 'the liberal, human, spiritual element gives way to practical need and material advantage'.

Then, surely, there is no more pathetic figure than the expert who is a stranger in every other realm but his own. In such cases, specialization is cultural deformity.

The effect of specialization on moral education is all too plain. Education, to be moral, must be education at the total depth of human personality—a fact which specialization does not recognize. Moreover, specialization may lead to a paralysis of 'lay opinion', and in the sphere of morality and religion to a suspension of the right of private judgement.

In any discussion of 'examinations' and 'specialization' it is a temptation to wax eloquent about the evils they produce, without offering any more satisfactory solution. There are indications of a new approach, but we are very much in the period of trial and error. It is not clear what will be the shape of things to come. One can but hope that any failures will not give rise to a stampede back to the past. Those best fitted to serve the cause of education today and in the future are those who can bring out of their treasure of experience 'things new and old'.

RELIGION AND EDUCATION

We have said that the acceptance of the Christian doctrine of man in education implies, among other things, the education of man at the 'total depth of human personality'. Popularly stated, this means the cultivation of 'body, mind and spirit'. It is one of the declared aims of the Education Act, 1944, to provide for the 'spiritual, moral, mental and physical development of the community'. In pursuance of this aim provision is made for 'religious education'. In the first place, every school day must begin with an act of worship; and, in the second place, religious instruction shall be given in all schools, usually according to an Agreed Syllabus of Religious Instruction. These two provisions recognize the fact that religion is both an experience of worship and a body of belief.

This is important when 'religious education' is seen in relation to the changing pattern of education which has been described. Pestalozzi's belief that education should consist not so much of instruction as the awakening of experiences has had such an influence on educational practice that there is need for us to see its implications for Christian education.

It surely means that the task of the Christian teacher is to awaken the child's sense of God and need of God, and to provide for full expression of this

experience in worship, instruction, and action. It is clearly not sufficient to give formal instruction according to an agreed syllabus.

A Quaker statement expresses the truth of the matter: 'Religion is not a distinct technical department or occupation, but rather that which gives unity and inspiring power. Every strong purpose brings some unity; the highest of all purposes will bring truest unity to deep and varied forces of the soul' (*Can Religion be Taught? A Quaker View*). This is the key to education at the total depth of human personality.

If we are to be delivered from what M. L. Jacks, in *Total Education*, calls 'subject-ridden education', if we are to see our system of education really integrated, then we need to see again the place of religion in education.

For the Christian, education is inseparably linked with the evangelical purpose of the Church. It was this which John Wesley saw so clearly. For him, education was a corollary of the gospel of redemption.

In the Providence of God, new educational theories were to hand to provide moulds in which shape could be given to the preaching of Wesley. We are now in a position to assess some of the results of this synthesis of the gospel of redemption and new educational theories.

In the first place, 'Education for all' is now an accepted principle. It would never occur to many educational reformers in the last 200 years that there was any close connexion between their watchword and Charles Wesley's reiteration: 'For all, for all, my Saviour died; For all my Lord was crucified.' Yet it is plain that the one is a natural inference from the other. As we said earlier, it is inconceivable that education should be for the few when the gospel is for all.

In the second place, it is being increasingly recognized that education must be at the total depth of human personality. While the credit for this in its practical application belongs to Rousseau and Pestalozzi, it is manifestly plain to all familiar with the preaching of Wesley that this is also an implication of the Gospel of Redemption. Wesley believed that the grace of God could transform a man to the total depth of his personality. Dr Gordon Rupp regards this as one of the outstanding contributions of the Methodist witness. In the doctrine of Perfect Love, there is 'the promise that there is no limit, apart from that inherent in bodily existence in a fallen world, to what God can do for men here and now' (*London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, July 1953, p. 168).

In the third place, we have passed from eighteenth-century formalism in religion and education to experientialism. In its extreme manifestations it is grotesque. In the realm of religion it is to be seen in the methods of certain evangelistic sects and movements. In education it is to be seen in the so-called 'freedom schools' and odd experiments in permitting children to give expression to every impulse good or bad. Sound principles are always open to abuse. We may safely leave such caricatures to end in oblivion. There is a healthy 'experiential' approach to education today, and this has been made possible by the breakdown of the rigid formalism of the eighteenth century which Wesley on the one hand and Rousseau and Pestalozzi on the other did much to commence.

It remains for the twentieth century to bring these trends to full fruition. It is a task full of adventure. It means that we have to see the close connexion

between 'evangelism' and 'education'. Indeed, rightly understood, education is a mode of evangelism. As so often in *Christian Education*, Spencer Leeson has the right word: 'The teacher's task is nothing less than to assist in the formation of human personality for God—that is, that those committed to him may fulfil the destiny from the beginning intended for them.'

G. THOMPSON BRAKE

POPULAR-SONG THEOLOGY

IT IS A sign of our times that if you hear the words 'popular-song' there immediately comes into your mind the sort of song played by a dance band or exhibited in florid sheet music in a music-shop window. It shows how far the world of jazz has appropriated the term 'popular' to its own exclusive use. Popular songs are still sung, and composed, which owe nothing to 'swing' or jazz, but their number, like that of church congregations, is fewer than it used to be.

It is not easy to define a popular song, but one might describe it as a song known, liked, sung, and used by the people. The term thus covers a very wide range, including folk-music and compositions of past centuries. But here I am considering popular songs composed within living memory and published commercially—noting, if I may borrow a phrase that surely has occurred in some distinguished religio-philosophical journal, the 'incidence of their theological implicates'.

Difficult as it may be to realize, there was a time when there was no 'swing' or jazz. This means that popular songs had their origin on the concert-platform or the boards of the music-hall. The parentage of the contemporary popular song is either the concert item or the old 'comic song' or a mixture of both. It was, for instance, the adaptation of the English music-hall comic song to a ballroom dance with four beats to the bar (the 'fox-trot') that in this country made possible the beginning of modern dance music.

Now music publishers have for a long time made a distinction between the sort of song that is sung at a popular concert and the sort of song that is sung

by the vocalist of a dance orchestra while people either sit and listen or dance. The concert-platform song is called a 'ballad', while that performed by a dance band, 'with vocal refrain', is called a 'number'. This is a useful distinction in nomenclature, despite the first title's inaccuracy, and the vagueness of the second—although 'number' does show the original pit whence the composition was digged—the music-hall.

This sketch of the historical background of the popular song has been necessary for two reasons. First, because there has been a bewildering promiscuity between diverse types of words and music, and, second, because any theological reference in a popular 'number' usually reflects the attitude of its parent-form, the 'ballad'. In its content the 'ballad' has been the precursor of the 'number', especially in songs 'which contain a message'—as a young salesman described them to me.

Anyone living before the First World War will remember that distinctions in most things, including songs, were much sharper then than they have now become. A pre-1914 father and mother might not have been surprised to hear someone sing the words 'Answer me, Lord above, just what sin have I been guilty of?' but they would naturally have assumed that that was a phrase from a solo by Alexander or Sankey, to be rendered at the forthcoming Home Missions Meeting or the approaching visit of Gipsy Smith. Where would their eyebrows have gone if they had learnt that it was sung with saxophone accompaniment to the slow gyrations of couples in a dance-hall?

What has happened is that the sacred song, the 'ballad', and the dance 'number' have been married and intermarried and have produced a numerous progeny of hybrids—most of them showing a progressively vitiated mentality. But they all have an Abraham to their father—the mind and theological attitude of the 'ballad' lyric-writer.

We come then to the tenets of popular song theology, and the first article of faith is that God is Sentimental Love. A 'ballad' of yesteryear, little known now, sharply illustrates the commonly-met attitude. It is called *Dear old Friends of Mine*, and the first two verses are taken up with saying how the singer is grateful for his companions who now are reaching age and infirmity. The third verse runs as follows:

*Dear old friends of mine,
When the last boat sails in for you,
I hope the angel who guides the helm
Will say there's room for two.
And when you reach the other side
And you hear God's voice divine,
He'll say, 'Well done!
Here's the crown you've won,
Dear old friends of mine!'*

The first article of the popular song creed could thus be put as: 'I believe in God the Grandfather Almighty'.

The second article might be written: 'Whose sufficient work is to bless, comfort and serve'. God's function as Blesser finds exemplification in the all-too-frequent rendering of *Bless This House*, where He is given detailed instructions

for His benediction to fall on various appointments and fittings, from the damp-course to the chimney-pots. And if anyone is inclined to dismiss this matter as trivial and innocuous, let him consider how many prayers in the minister's vestry and prayers at meetings and even prayers from the pulpit are for the most part a catena of sentences each beginning with the word 'Bless'. Let him also consider the hymn *Bless, O Lord, the village Road* by the Director of the Department of News Service of the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church of America—a hymn accepted by the Hymn Society of America in 1955. The first verse is as follows:

*Bless, O Lord, the village road;
Bless the trav'ler, bless his load;
Bless each home and bless each mart:
Praise to Thee stir every heart.*

There are four more verses which enumerate eighteen further items to be blessed, including 'the law', 'the shop', and 'our simple, peaceful days', though not, for some reason, the days which are difficult or busy.

No Christian will underestimate his need of God's blessing, or cease to ask Him for it, but the over-emphasis upon God's action as Blessor leads and has led to the neglect of His essential work as Saviour. I wonder how often *I'll Walk Beside You* has been sung in a church service or meeting, with the implication, in such a setting, that the 'I' of the song is God. It hits off perfectly the popular song's attitude to what God exists to do, and, whether the song's composer knows it or not, he has brought off a highly successful ambiguity.

'Thou has made me to serve with thy sins,' said the Lord to an exiled Israel. But I doubt whether Isaiah found as crass an example of making God serve as the words of the modern *Answer Me* suggest. About two years ago *Answer Me* was the No. 1 hit song for eight successive weeks of 'Top Twenty'—a programme of 'numbers' broadcast nightly from Radio Luxembourg. And it is worth while noting that the supremacy in popularity of 'Top Twenty' is not determined by a Gallup Poll or the number of listener's letters, but by the commercial test of the number of copies sold! Here is what you might have heard either Mr Laine or Mr Whitfield singing every night of that period:

*Answer me, Lord above
Just what sin have I been guilty of?
Tell me how I came to lose my love;
Please answer me, O Lord.
She was mine yesterday,
I believed that love was here to stay.
Won't you tell me where I've gone astray.
Please answer me, O Lord.*

*If she's happier without me,
Don't tell her I care.
But if she still thinks about me
Please let her hear my prayer.*

*Let her know I've been true,
Send her back so we can start anew,
In my sorrow may I turn to you?
Please answer me, O Lord.*

In fair parenthesis, it perhaps should be said that after a few broadcasts in England, the B.B.C. ordered the words to be altered from 'O Lord' to 'my love', and the item was reshaped to an appeal to his lady love by the unstrung lover. The sheet music, however, still has the version quoted above.

In such a business as producing popular songs and 'numbers', of course, one cannot expect to discover a systematic theology, however heretical and half-baked. Nonetheless, four hierarchs of the world of 'swing' have attempted to formulate a creed, in a song properly entitled *I Believe*. Article One says: 'I believe for every drop of rain that falls a flower grows.' It is a nice point for the consideration of our theologians whether this article affirms a natural cosmology or a natural teleology. Article Two: 'I believe that somewhere in the darkest night a candle glows.' It may be going beyond the proper bound of scholarly deduction, but may we not see here an adumbration of realized eschatology? Article Three: 'I believe for every one who goes astray, someone will come to show the way'. Here, of course, is swing soteriology. But who is the 'someone?' Ah yes, indeed! Perhaps ere long a minuscule of the Frances Day and Hunter family of MSS. will be discovered, showing a capital S. Article Four: 'I believe above the storm the smallest prayer will still be heard. I believe that someone in the great somewhere hears every word.' Trine need not have bothered to write his book; these people are already 'in tune with the Infinite'—*unknown*! Article Five (and last): 'Every time I hear a new-born baby cry, or touch a leaf [I will permit myself my own exclamation-mark here:!] or see the sky, then I know why I believe.' Some may feel that the last clause is a logical *non-sequitur*, but swing theologians know that faith is above logic—by gum! they do—and no one can say that their creed does not end on a doctrine of assurance!

During the last eighteen months, song 'numbers' have appeared which in verbal content approximate to Moody and Sankey, though in their sequent rather than in their repetitive verse-form. This development calls for notice, for whatever just criticism one might make of the theology, not to say the versification, of these recent songs, there is no doubt of the seriousness, and greater depth, with which they take their religion. Consider this chorus: 'It is no secret what God can do, What He's done for others He'll do for you. With arms wide open He'll pardon you, It is no secret what God can do.'

Another song, entitled *In the Beginning* describes how the Lord made 'the earth, the heaven, the hills and the seas', and, narrating the acts of creation pretty much in the order of the first chapter of Genesis, mentions that the Lord sanctified the seventh day for man, who, being in the image of his Maker, shall have dominion over all. This song concludes with an exhortation to prayer and faith so that God's originally perfect creation shall attain perfection again.

As anyone can see, this is an astonishing advance on the vapid religiosity of earlier songs. In fact, one can almost hear *In the Beginning* sung by a choir of

picked Christians led by Canon Raven! And this song is not alone. Another recent publication begins: 'When I see a beggar on the busy street, and watch him as the people pass him by, I thank the Lord above and worship at His feet, For there but for the grace of God, go I'. And yet another, *His Hands*, ends: 'I've been lost in the shuffle; I've obeyed the wrong command; I'm going back to the chapel in search of His Hand.'

How has the song of personal religious need come to be popular? Three things contribute part if not the whole of the answer. Since the last war, certain religious organizations, mostly American, have had a long series of 'revival hours' broadcast from Radio Luxembourg. These have gained a large listening public. Second, the influence of Dr Billy Graham has had a wide-spread effect. Third, because people must have a religion of some kind, and because that of the Christian Church and even the Christian Sunday-school is for increasing thousands not even now a memory, the religion sung by the dance-band vocalist comes with freshness to meet their need.

At this present time we have some popular religious songs. This is a new fact facing us. Those who take a leading part in modern evangelism have here a field of operations more far-reaching than any attained by mobile cinemas. But it is essential that they do not put up both hands in complete approval of this kind of item. Such a gesture could only mean surrender to and absorption by the popular religious song. Too many sincere believers have gone that way, and the result is always the loss of authority and power for the gospel. On the other hand, the matter must not be dismissed with a contemptuous witticism. The Church would indeed do a great thing if under its aegis songs were produced instinct with the dignity of the holy grace of the New Testament gospel, popular in the musical idiom of today, yet rid of the brash banality or the nauseating febrility of so much that now disserves us in our witness. As an editorial leader of the *Methodist Recorder* once said: 'If the theologians had a hand light enough for popular songs, or the song-writers a balanced view of the meaning of the Universe, what memorable and enjoyable things they might provide?'

K. VAUGHAN JONES

THE INFLUENCE OF PRESUPPOSITION ON CONVICTION

ONE OF the most celebrated of philosophical discussions concerns the question whether the mind is passive or active in the attainment of knowledge. Is its function an inert reception of external impressions, or an active co-operation with the phenomena which lead to such impressions? Is the mind a mere receptivity, or is it a creative agency?

The first view is associated with Locke, who likened the mind to a blank tablet, a *tabula rasa*, on which impressions were projected from the external world. In the process of cognition the mind played no active part; and the ideas eventually lodged in it were not in any sense formed or even affected by the mind in which they were stored.

This view was criticized by Kant in an epoch-making contribution to philosophic thought. He held that while phenomena were the *fons et origo* of impressions, they were of themselves incapable of transmuting the impressions into ideas. The process by which a sensation became a perception, and a perception an idea, was conducted by the mind itself.

Kant went further than this. He taught not only that the mind played a part in the cognitive process, but the major part. The interpretative activity of the mind was the main factor in the growth of knowledge in general, as in the formation of a single concept in particular. So far from the mind being an inert receptivity, mechanically operated on by objective agencies, the fact was that it controlled the objective agencies, stamping upon them its own characteristic interpretation. 'Instead of our mind, in order to know, adapting itself to the objects, cognition of which is sought, what actually happens is that all objects are under the necessity of adapting themselves to our mind.'¹

The discussion between these two antagonistic views has for us today historic rather than practical interest. For the Kantian view of a mental initiative in knowledge has superseded the older belief associated with the name of Locke, and is a permanent contribution to human thought. 'This is the supreme merit of Kant, to have shown the activity of the mind itself in the work of perception. The mind is not, as Locke called it, a *tabula rasa*—a blank surface upon which the outer world makes impressions. Our universe, our experience, is . . . very far from being an unsorted jumble of sense-impressions.'² It is with the logical issues and practical significance of this belief that the present article is concerned.

1

We start then from the position that the mind puts its own interpretation on the impressions it receives, and that therefore the content and nature of the knowledge of an individual are affected by the capacity and peculiarities of his intellectual equipment—or, to speak more correctly, of his personality, since the psychic life of man is an intimate whole, thought, feeling and will, the three departments of it, continually reacting on and influencing one another. It follows from this that absolute impartiality is impossible. We approach every

consideration with the inevitable presuppositions arising from our past experience. Of course, the extent to which this affects the issue depends on the subject-matter under consideration. In the abstract sciences—pure mathematics, for instance—the power of presupposition is reduced to a minimum; it may even be said to be non-existent. But when we approach the concrete sciences—those intimately connected with the life of man—the influence of presupposition becomes far-reaching. In dealing with these the ‘personal equation’ can never be eliminated.

As an example of a concrete science we may take history. Since the study of history is by no means the conning of dry, colourless facts, but rather the consideration of events which are full of human interest and vitally related in many ways to our contemporary lot, an impartial historian, in the full sense of the term, is an impossibility. Bishop Gore, while emphasizing that it is an obligation ‘to submit simply to evidence’ in historical matters, is equally emphatic that ‘it is absurd to deny the necessity of presuppositions in accepting evidence—absurd to pretend that, in matters affecting us nearly, we can possibly annihilate the wish to believe or disbelieve; indeed this sort of wish has been actually the great stimulus to enquiry of all sorts’.³

But, it may be asked, will not the influence of presupposition inevitably vitiate the judgement? ‘I believe’, says John Fiske, speaking of T. H. Huxley, ‘there was nothing in life which he dreaded so much as the sin of allowing his reason to be hoodwinked by personal predilections’.⁴ Is not this tendency, whether we call it a sin or not, to be carefully guarded against? The answer is that presupposition must not be confounded with prejudice. A presupposition is a mental bias which leads an enquirer to be disposed to accept a given interpretation of certain facts; but a prejudice is, as the word implies, a ‘prejudging’ of the case before the evidence has been sifted and examined. The former by no means precludes fair inquiry, nor does it vitiate the result of such inquiry—indeed, to repeat Bishop Gore’s words, it has been ‘the great stimulus to inquiry of all sorts’. To presuppose is still to leave oneself open to careful examination of evidence, and to conviction arising therefrom. But to prejudice is to shut out consideration; it is to rule all the evidence out of court.

It is this evil influence of prejudice—a prejudging of the case without inquiry—and not the influence of presupposition, that has wrought so much mischief in theological thought through the ages. John Stuart Mill speaks of ‘the obstinate prejudice which makes men unable to see what is before their eyes because it is contrary to their expectations’.⁵ The regrettable obscurantism of not a few Christian leaders in the past has its explanation here. They were so obsessed by mistaken standards of authority that all free inquiry was to them impossible, in others hateful, and even *per se* wicked. For instance, the mistaken notion that the Bible was an authority on matters of science led to the unthinking rejection of the Copernician system of astronomy by the contemporary theologians, and in the nineteenth century to the equally irrational opposition to the theory of Evolution. But this outcome of ‘obstinate prejudice’ must be carefully distinguished from the radically different influence of presupposition.

Presupposition, then, does not foreclose enquiry, but rather prompts it, adds a zest to it, and in the ultimate analysis is that which makes it possible. If there are those who have a lingering distrust of it, it is either because they

confound it with prejudice, or because, consciously or unconsciously, they hold the obsolete conception of cognitive processes taught by Locke.

2

Theology is the most concrete of the sciences, for it has more intimate connexions with the various departments of our complex personality than any other matter of study. Therefore, to a greater extent than any other science, it will be affected by the initial presumptions which an individual brings to its consideration, by the mental and moral biases arising from his experience and character.

The central fact in Christianity, and therefore in Christian theology, is the Incarnation. Here is the pivot of the Christian system. Now just as it is impossible to isolate the Incarnation from its context in history, and regard it as an unrelated event in time, so it is impossible for a thinker to isolate it from its context in his own mind, and look upon it as a separate, solitary matter of thought, having no reference to the other parts of his mental experience. In other words, it is impossible for anyone to approach the consideration of the Incarnation without presuppositions of one sort or another. Not only so, but the nature of the presuppositions will tend to determine the view of the Incarnation ultimately adopted.

The great presupposition with which men are approaching the study of all branches of science today is the disbelief in chance, the presupposition that the world is rationally ordered, and therefore can be the subject of rational research—in other words, can be intelligibly known. This may be described as the fundamental axiom of modern scientific inquiry, and it leads, naturally and inevitably, to another position, which may be stated in the words of Darwin: 'The impossibility of conceiving that this grand and wondrous universe, with our conscious selves, arose through chance, seems to me the chief argument for the existence of God.'⁶ That is to say, the conviction that the universe is the expression of intelligent principles leads to Theism as furnishing the only reasonable explanation of the Cosmos.

Now this belief in Theism, thus rationally arrived at, is the fundamental presupposition of a belief in the Incarnation. For Theism means far more than that the universe is an outcome of the divine activity and an expression of the divine intelligence. If our study of the created order leads to a belief in the existence of God, it as certainly teaches us that He is a God who cares for His creation. In spite of all the apparent contradictions that seem to militate against this belief, the divine beneficence is writ large upon the whole of nature. From this it is but a step to the further position that such a beneficent Deity is One who, in obedience to the dictates of His own beneficence, would reveal Himself to man. A God who delights in the highest well-being of His creatures is one who would be likely to impart that which is the greatest requisite to their truest happiness—the knowledge of Himself.

This is the great presumption which makes possible—indeed, leads to—a belief in the Incarnation. A presupposition in favour of universal order leads to a belief in Theism; Theism leads to a belief in divine revelation to man; and it is this belief that God has been gradually manifesting Himself through the ages, lodged as a presupposition in the mind, that makes the Incarnation rational and leads to a firm belief in it. Let a man approach such a stupendous

proposition as God manifest in the flesh without this initial presupposition, and the likelihood is that he will refuse to believe in it. But let one who holds that through the ages God has been gradually imparting more and more adequate knowledge of Himself, that in the processes of nature and in the affairs of humanity we see the immanence of a divine mind—let such an one be brought face to face with the Incarnation, and he will be struck with its admirable congruity with all that he has learned of God's methods; he will recognize it as the natural consummation of an age-long process, the necessary *dénouement* to which the evolution of God's relations to humanity had been tending.

3

If then the influence of presupposition is so significant, a question of immense practical importance naturally arises: What determines the nature of the mental leanings and moral prepossessions of a given individual?

The answer cannot be doubtful. The great determinative factor in the formation of presuppositions is character. 'If we know the character or disposition of a man', says Lecky, 'we can usually predict with tolerable accuracy many of his opinions.'⁷ A person's presumptions—his instinctive way of looking at things—are an index to his inner nature. The interpretation we stamp upon phenomena is the reflex of our personality.

*Thou seest no beauty save thou make it first;
Man, Woman, Nature, each is but a glass
Wherein the soul sees the image of itself—
Visible echoes, offsprings of itself.⁸*

This is a principle which needs to be carefully stated, for obviously the argument that religious or theological views point back to character, with its corollary that inadequate ones spring from moral delinquency or unsatisfactoriness, must be used with great caution, or it may degenerate into an extremely reprehensible form of the *argumentum ad hominem*. But while being careful not to incur this condemnation, we may yet hold that there is a broad correspondence between thought and character, between what a man thinks and what he is. So close is the union between the various departments of the composite life of man that there is a vital reciprocity of relationship between each and all the others; and thus a man's moral state in a very real way affects, and is reflected in, his mental attitude. 'Nicolo Pisano', says Ruskin in his *Modern Painters*, 'got nothing but good, the modern French nothing but evil, from the study of the antique; but Nicolo Pisano had a God and a character.' And if a man has 'a God and a character', that fact will influence not only his instinctive insight and his artistic perception, but also his practical conduct, his intellectual acumen, and indeed every department and faculty of his being.

If, then, conviction is shaped by presupposition, and presupposition in turn is determined by character, it follows that in criticizing a man's views we are implicitly criticizing his character. And there the criticism rightly rests. 'Truth remains true, the fault's in the prover.'⁹ This must be borne in mind in all our theological discussions. However difficult it may be to apply the principle fairly, and however dangerous the use of it may be in incautious and unsympathetic hands, we must remember, if we are to estimate views correctly, that

the force of a man's moral and religious opinions is increased indefinitely, or reduced to nullity, by the worth or worthlessness of his character. And in this connexion it is to be noted that much adverse criticism of Christianity, especially the more violent forms of such criticism, derives from mean and low conceptions of the nature of man, and that these conceptions may, and often do, point back to unsatisfactoriness of personal character. An individual inevitably projects upon external phenomena the characteristics of his own inner life.

*My son, the world is dark with grief and graves,
So dark that men cry out against the Heavens.
Who knows but that the darkness is in man?*¹⁰

4

The main practical lesson which emerges here is, plainly, the importance of character-building. If conviction depends on presupposition, and presupposition points back to character, the most important thing that can engage the attention of those who are desirous of inculcating right conceptions of God and Truth is the art of moral education. It is almost as useless to discuss the great verities of religion with a man whose presuppositions are all wrong as it would be to discuss problems of colour with a man born blind. In dealing with such an one we must begin by attempting to remove his initial disqualification, and so make it possible for him to appreciate those great spiritual principles which the 'natural man' cannot discern, and which, lodged as presumptions in the mind, alone make possible the apprehension of religious truth. The answer to infidelity is not argument but education. And it is education that is needed today—education not merely intellectual but primarily moral, education which will lead on to those great fundamental presuppositions which alone make possible true mental insight.

This principle has most significant application to the training of the young. Nothing is more vitally important, if a man is to be qualified in after years for holding adequate conceptions of the great matters of life, than that his moral nature, while yet in the plastic stage, should be rightly impressed and moulded. As Christian teachers, we should pin our faith less to catastrophic reversals of character in later life than to the careful moral training of those who come under our care in their early years, and to the constant attempt to build up their characters from the first in truth and love. The aim of early education should be to introduce into the very texture of the mental nature such an axiomatic conviction of the beauty of holiness and the sinfulness of sin as shall prove a permanent antidote to the later inroads of cynicism in all its forms. A mind which in its formative stages has had lodged in it a 'presumption in favour of all beauty and sanctity in human life and in the universe'—to quote Martineau's fine definition of faith¹¹—is one that is fundamentally qualified for the consideration of all the problems of conduct and destiny, and one that is antecedently likely to come to right conclusions on these great matters. A. G. CURNOW

¹ H. R. Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology*, p.19.

² Beibitz, *Belief, Faith, and Proof*, p.57.

³ Bampton Lectures, p.56.

⁴ Quo. by Prof. R. A. Gregory in *Discovery: the Spirit and Service of Science*, p.27.

⁵ *Autobiography*, p.26.

⁶ *Life and Letters*, p.57.

⁷ *Hist. of European Morals*, Vol. 2, p.192.

⁸ Lowell, *The Parting of the Ways*.

⁹ Browning, *Christmas Eve*.

¹⁰ Tennyson, *The Ancient Sage*.

¹¹ *Hours of Thought*, Vol. 1, p.92.

COMMON SENSE, SCIENCE, AND RELIGION

I DO NOT wish to discuss common sense, science, and religion in order to bring common sense to bear on the conflict between science and religion; nor do I wish to expatiate on the crimes of science, for plenty of stones are cast at science in this atomic age without my desiring to cast another. What I am concerned to do is rather to suggest points of likeness between religion (which is often despised as unreal, unpractical, and visionary) and science and common sense (which are regarded as practical).

What I wish to say is that all these three—common sense, science, and religion—are ways of knowing; that so far as their origin is concerned, they all begin at the same level, in an act of faith, and so far as their end is concerned, they all terminate at the same level, in a practical test; and finally, that all three are necessary, and that each one of the three is incomplete in the report it brings to us of the human situation until it is completed by the reports brought to us by the other two.

Let us begin with some definitions.

What is common sense? When most people are asked this question, they find themselves in the position of St Augustine when he was asked, 'What is time?' His answer was, '*Si non rogas, intelligo*'—'If you don't ask me the question, I know the answer!'¹ But as soon as you ask the question, I find that it is a very difficult matter indeed to give a good reply. We use such phrases as these: 'Mrs Brown must be out of her senses.' 'Mr Brown has got no common sense.' And when we use these phrases we imply that the person whom we are describing is without practical wisdom in the management of life. This is a justifiable and universal use of the expression 'common sense', but we must look at the matter rather more closely. How should a person know the correct way of behaving in the world in which he finds himself? He can only know this from the nature of the world itself. But how does he know the nature of the world? The answer to this is that he sees it, he hears its music and its noise, he touches the people and things in it, he tastes and smells it. He has five senses in common with the rest of humanity. Each of these five common senses brings him a report of the world outside him. From the reports of his senses he builds up an account of the world which is his environment, and then, if he has common sense, he applies this account in a practical way so as always to act in an appropriate manner.

What is science? It is a refinement of common sense. The knowledge of life which common sense gives is rough and ready. Science builds on this rough and ready knowledge, but is different from common sense in being systematic and formulated. It uses the methods of deduction, and of induction and experiment.

Common sense and science are both attempts to give us knowledge of reality in terms of man and the world. Religion postulates that if to man and the world we add God, then we get a more accurate and valuable picture of reality. But religion is like common sense and science in this fact, that it is a way of knowing about our life in the world.

Having made some attempt at definition, we can now turn to our thesis and try to develop it.

Common sense is a way of knowing, because through it we have the knowledge that there is a multiform world outside us and also the knowledge of how we are to use that world. But that knowledge is not gained quite so simply as we sometimes suppose. Common sense may tell a teacher, for example, that there is a table before him as he speaks to his class. Sight tells him so, for he can see it; touch tells him so, for he can feel how hard and smooth it is. But let us consider the table more attentively. First of all, let us consider its colour. Suppose it is brown. Yet certain parts of it, the parts of it that reflect the light, will certainly not appear brown, but white. If the teacher came into the room at dusk or in the night, the table would either be black or else it would have no colour at all. And we all know that if a colour-blind man looked at it, or a man wearing coloured glasses, then he would see it quite a different colour from the brown we have just asserted. Common sense replies to all this that the *real* colour is, nevertheless, brown. But it does not easily appear by what criterion common sense is enabled to make this dogmatic judgement.

A similar problem arises with regard to the shape of the table. It is oblong, we say. But it is only oblong to the eye of the person who is suspended in mid-air directly and centrally above it. To most observers it appears to be a quadrilateral of some sort, but not a quadrilateral with four right angles. It seems rather to have two obtuse angles and two acute angles. As a matter of fact, the table has as many shapes as it has observers. Perhaps, indeed, none of them is its *real* shape.

It is the same with the texture. It looks smooth. But if we looked at it through a very powerful microscope it would be seen to be a matter of hills and valleys, very rough indeed. It does not appear how we are to decide what is its real texture, whether smooth or rough. Perhaps, indeed, it has no *real* texture. If we find ourselves in a difficulty over the colour of the table, its shape, and its texture, it is at least reasonable to suggest that perhaps it has no *real* colour, no *real* shape, and no *real* texture. In fact, it is reasonable to suggest that there is no table there at all.

The answer of common sense to this suggestion is generally like this: 'Oh, yes! Of course there's a table there, because it is not only I who see it. But Mr Black sees it and Mr White sees it and Mr Brown sees it, so it must be there.' Such an answer, of course, begs the question. For if we do not know that the table is there, we certainly do not know that Mr Black is there, nor Mr White nor Mr Brown, and we cannot refer to them for proof. I suggest that here common sense, in the contemplation of any simple object, finds itself in the same position as we shall admit religion finds itself. It cannot *prove* that there is a table there, so it assumes it. That is to say, it makes an act of faith and builds its further knowledge on that act of faith.

The table's existence cannot be proved. Nor, for that matter, can it be disproved. We all perform the act of faith that the table is there and we have performed it so often and so habitually that we no longer realize that we are making an act of faith at all. We assume that our mind is reliable in telling us that all the sense-data which different people perceive belong to one material unit which really exists. We also make the further assumption that our senses,

in conveying sense-data to our minds, are themselves trustworthy. But they may not be. A drunkard who walks into a lamp-post sees stars. Where are these stars? If they are only in his mind, perhaps the other bodies that he sees are only in his mind as well. From considerations such as these have been developed all the various idealist and phenomenalist philosophies; but I do not propose to pursue these any further, because I do not believe them. Nor do many people. We believe rather that there is a real material world outside of ourselves; we are realists. I think we do right to adopt this position, but, doing so, we are making an act of faith; so that in this way, common sense begins where religion begins, in faith.

The test of the validity of this act of faith is that it works. If we assume the reliability of our senses and if we assume the independent existence of the external world, we find that everything fits in together and there are practical results. If we did not make the act of faith, we should suppose ourselves, as it were, to be standing at a lamp-post that was not there waiting for a bus that was not coming. That is to say, everything would be a dream.

Science is also a way of knowing. Science is concerned to have a more accurate knowledge of the external world than that which is presented by common sense. Science is characterized by system and exact formulation and for the last 300 years it has been endlessly productive. It has given us railways, buses, aeroplanes, steamships, electricity, wireless, and all the benefits of modern medicine. It is not surprising that the scientist can command a good salary, and that science is held in the highest reverence. Recently, indeed, there has been a tendency to discover the idol's feet of clay, and science has come in for a great deal of abuse, not so much because of its discoveries as because of the dangerous possibilities of its discoveries. Nevertheless, science still is regarded as being eminently practical and useful, so long as its application is guarded. I wish to suggest that science, like common sense, also begins by making an act of faith. In this case, the act of faith is not simply that there is an external sphere of material bodies, but that this external sphere is a universe and not a multiverse. Science assumes that law reigns throughout the universe. This is an act of faith which lies beyond the possibility of proof.

Let us look at it in this way. Science uses the method of deduction, argument from the general to the particular, but lays its emphasis specially on the method of induction, argument from the particular to the general. In neither of these methods is proof, strictly speaking, possible. In deduction we argue thus:

All men are mortal.

The Lord Mayor of London is a man.

Therefore the Lord Mayor of London is mortal.

This is the syllogism. It appears to be flawless, and indeed it is flawless if you are sure that your major premise, 'All men are mortal', is true. But you cannot be sure of this until first you have examined every man, including the Lord Mayor of London, and seen that they are all mortal. This means that your conclusion was assumed in your major premise, and the argument as a whole is a truism. Deduction seems to be impossible unless you allow an initial assumption.

But science uses principally the method of induction. This is argument from particular instances to a general rule. Thus, Socrates is mortal; St Paul is mortal; Shakespeare is mortal; Darwin is mortal; Stalin is mortal; therefore all men are mortal. As many particular instances as possible are examined, and on the basis of them a general rule is built. But, strictly speaking, this argument is invalid also, because although you may examine every instance you know of, there may nevertheless be one instance of which you do not know which gives the lie to your entire argument.

We agree, for instance, that the sun will rise tomorrow because it has hitherto risen every day. But to believe that the future will resemble the past is obviously an act of faith; we cannot prove it. We are in no better position than the chicken who has been fed by the same man every morning. The chicken might be considered to argue thus: in the past that man has brought me food every morning; therefore in the future that man will bring me food every morning. But the argument is proved to be invalid when one morning towards Christmas the man comes along, not with a pail of food, but with a chopper.

The only conclusion we can properly reach from the fact that we have many examples of sunrise occurring in the past is that the occurrence in the future is most probable. A practical belief in the sunrise is an act of faith. And so it is with *induction* in general. Because so many instances prove true, it does not follow that a rule will always hold. But without assuming that the rule will always hold, science could not proceed at all, and so it makes the act of faith which is necessary to give it a world of law, a true universe.

The test of the validity of science is in its fruits. If it works, then it is true. We are all convinced of the truth of science, not by any system of logic but by atomic fission, electric light, penicillin, and the rest. It is because of the technical application of science that nobody can live nowadays without believing in science, for here its practical value appears.

In the ways we have just been considering, *religion* is comparable with science and common sense. Thus:

1. It is a way of knowing, and we who are religious claim indeed that it is the indispensable form for one who would know the true nature of reality.

2. Its origin is in an act of faith. Here, to avoid equivocation, let me say that I am using the word 'faith' in the same sense as I have already used it in connexion with science and common sense. The act of faith here goes beyond that of common sense (that there is a world outside us) and that of science (that the world outside us is ruled by law) in saying that the world outside us is made and ruled by God.

3. The end and test of religion is a practical one. If this act of faith helps us to formulate an increasing system of knowledge and to understand reality, and if it works, then it is true. Jesus said: 'The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them.'² And as faith in Him was justified by its practical results, so religion in general is justified by its practical results, and in this it is exactly like common sense and science.

These three ways of knowing, then, all begin in faith and are all tested by their works. Finally, I wish to say that none by itself is adequate for life, because none by itself gives us a complete report of the human situation. Each

requires the other two, and in truth there can be never any real conflict between any of them. Since they are all ways of knowing, and since knowing produces knowledge, and since knowledge is of the truth, and since the truth is one and indivisible, there can be no genuine conflict between them. Conflicts have arisen, and will doubtless still arise, but they are not between science and religion, or common sense and religion; they are conflicts between theological intransigence and scientific arrogance, between academic pride and clerical dogmatism. Common sense and religion each need the others, and I propose to illustrate this interdependence with some brief paragraphs.

1. Common sense needs science, for common sense could not produce M. and B. tablets or jet propulsion.

2. Common sense needs religion, for common sense has no saving value.

3. Science needs common sense, for even the most wonderfully accurate machine still needs to be read by the human eye.

4. Science needs religion, for it has no sense of values and man needs values as well as facts.

5. Religion needs common sense. This is what happens when religion is divorced from common sense. If the two are divorced, one gets the kind of behaviour that is well exemplified in J. H. Smyth-Pigott. He was one of three Church of England clergymen who joined the Salvation Army in 1884, but in 1889 he left it and joined the Agapemonites led by Henry James Prince in Spaxton, Somerset. He himself became leader in 1899, and announced that he was the Messiah. Then the Messiah took Ruth Annie Preece as his spiritual bride and by her he had two material sons, whom he named Power and Glory. Subsequently he had a daughter, and he named her Hallelujah. He called himself the Lamb of God, and, clad in white, invited the adoration of all the faithful.

6. Finally, religion needs science. I was recently presented with a reproduction of Michelangelo's Moses. When it was given to me I noticed the rugged strength of it and that the figure was holding two tablets or books. But then I saw the figure had horns, and I felt sure that this could not be Moses at all, but must be some lascivious satyr. That was not so, however. The reason for the horns was that in Hebrew, as in English, there are some words that have two meanings, and in the story of Moses we may read either that when Moses came down from the mountain his face gave forth beams or that it gave forth horns. Jerome in his translation chose the wrong word, and ever since, every Roman Catholic representation of Moses is complete with horns. Thus does faith sorely need the correction of science to save it from such ludicrous absurdities.

Common sense, science, and religion are, therefore, three ways of knowing reality, each beginning in faith, each proved by practical tests, and each needing the other two in order to give us an adequate picture of reality, and to enable us to manage our lives successfully in the human situation.

FRANK CALLISTER

¹ St Augustine, *Confessions*, xi.14.

² Matthew 11_g.

THE FAMILY OF GOD

He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father (John 14,)

FATHERHOOD and family are inseparable; each implies the other. To talk of a family of nations or the brotherhood of man without the Fatherhood of God is foolish; to believe in the Fatherhood of God, and not to seek a family of nations, is futile. The Fatherhood is fundamental. It came not by a development of thought, but as the dawning of a new day. It was made manifest in a personal life that has become 'the Light of the World'. All suggestions of the fatherliness of God that came before Jesus Christ were but foregleams. 'Jesus used the name Father', says Dr Scott Lidgett, 'so as to outshine all other use of it, as the sun outshines the morning star.'¹ Yet the morning star serves a purpose as harbinger of the coming day. So these foregleams of God's fatherliness reveal the aspirations of the human heart that find their fulfilment in Jesus Christ.

It is important that we should examine the foundations of our theme, as found in the New Testament. The late J. M. Robertson, in his ponderous but now almost forgotten volumes, *Pagan Christs*, informed the world that 'Christianity could not be scientific or it would not go back to A.D. 1 for its best.' That was both a foolish and an unscientific statement, for science looks back to creation for its still undiscovered 'best'; it is the business of science to find what has been there a very long time. So Christianity finds its data, and its still *unrealized* 'best', in Jesus Christ.

At twelve years of age, now 'a son of the Law', Jesus is taken by His parents to the Passover Festival in Jerusalem. When the parents set out for home with their caravan, the boy Jesus is unwittingly left behind. Turning back to search for Him, they find Him, after three days, in the Temple among the teachers. In reply to His mother's anxious protests, He says 'Why did you look for me? Did you not know that I had to be *at my Father's house*?'² They did not understand Him. His words were simple enough in themselves. But 'my Father', spoken like that, was new—amazingly new. New to them, it was new to the world. This clear, unclouded consciousness of God as 'Father' never left Him. His whole life and ministry were the unfolding of it. 'Father' is the name He invariably gives to God.

We come next to His baptism and the opening of His public ministry. The baptism is accompanied by a profound experience in which He hears the confirming voice: 'Thou art *my beloved son*; in thee I am well pleased.'³ In the strength of this assurance, He goes through His great temptation, and sets out upon His great mission of 'good tidings to the poor'.

He begins now to teach men that God is their Father also. 'The peacemakers' among them 'shall be called the children of God'.⁴ They are so to live that men will glorify their Father;⁵ to 'be perfect, as their Father which is in heaven is perfect'.⁶ 'Your Father', He assures them, knows the things you need. 'Your heavenly Father' feeds the birds; He 'clothes the grass of the field' with 'glory'. It is always 'Your Father'⁷ who cares for the lower creation—all sentient life comes within God's Fatherly care for the sake of His children. The destiny of 'the whole creation' is bound up with them.⁸

Jesus teaches men to pray 'Our Father' in the most universal of all prayers. He imposes no credal test on those who so pray. No spiritual experience is first demanded of them. These men, even the best of them, were but beginners. In no deep sense were they yet converted. Peter denied Him; Judas betrayed Him; 'they all forsook Him'. Yet they may call God 'Father' without exception or restriction. The prayer is not limited to the 'converted'. Whenever and wherever men turn to God, they are free to say, 'Our Father'. 'God', says Dr Selbie, 'is to all men potentially, what He was to Jesus in very truth.'¹⁰

Perhaps the most important passage for our purpose, in the story of Jesus Himself, is that in Matthew 11_{27ff.}: 'All things have been delivered unto me by my Father. And no one knoweth the son save the Father; neither doth any know the Father save the son, and he to whom the son willeth to reveal Him. Come unto me all ye that are heavy-laden and I will give you rest.' It is perfectly clear that Jesus here claims a unique relationship to the Father, in virtue of which He reveals the Father; so that they to whom He is revealed will know the Father too, and in that knowledge will find rest. Jesus gives rest by revealing the Father. There are burdens and barriers to be removed; there are sins to be forgiven; but in the knowledge of the Father alone is rest.

When the end draws nigh and the agony is already upon Him, He prays 'Father, if Thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done'.¹¹ It is the Father's will that He accepts. Finally, having passed through the agony in the garden, the mockery of a trial, and the dark mystery of the unanswered question: 'My God, my God, *why* hast Thou forsaken Me?'¹² (in this very mystery sharing the darkest experience of man's earthly life) with His last breath He utters once more the name most used and most loved of all: 'Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit.'¹³

Such, in brief outline, is the story as told in the first three (Synoptic) Gospels. We turn now to the interpreters of that story. Three are outstanding: St Paul, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the author of the Fourth Gospel. That is their order in time; but it seems best to follow the reverse order in treatment.

In the Fourth Gospel, where narrative and interpretation are found side by side, we have perhaps the fullest interpretation. The Gospel opens with a prologue of great beauty, held by many to be 'the greatest passage in literature'. In words of crystal clarity, matched with profound insight, it interprets both creation and revelation in the light of Jesus. It has been called 'a second creation story', yet its main theme is *the revelation of God in a Son*. It establishes the Fatherhood of God for all mankind and for the whole creation.

These are the salient sentences for our purpose:

In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God.

All things were made through him, and without him was not anything made that hath been made.

And the Logos was made flesh and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth.¹⁴

The word 'Logos' defies translation into any word of the English—and probably of any other—language. Dr Moffatt leaves it untranslated. It was

current among Greek-speaking thinkers, conveying the 'thought, reason, wisdom' of God expressed in the universe. It is prominent in the thought of Plato and of Philo. But the fact that its use by Plato the Greek and Philo the Jew (with their different approaches) approximates to that of this prologue does not weaken, but rather strengthens its authority here. For 'God left not himself without witness'¹⁵ in any age or nation; certainly not among such as Plato or Philo represented. But previous meanings are relatively unimportant; the meaning given to it here is vital. It is the identification of the Logos—personal, pre-existent, divine, agent in creation—with Jesus that is the message of the prologue. Yet this is not all its message; for Jesus, *as Son*, reveals the Father 'whom no man hath seen at any time'.¹⁶

This conclusion is not argued; it is announced. It is not reached by discussion, but by insight. They had *seen Jesus*. And looking at Him, in His earthly life and death and His risen glory, this is His meaning for them: 'we beheld his glory, glory as of the only-begotten of the Father'.

Through the Logos the author looks back to creation; through the Son he looks forward to redemption. But Logos and Son are one; the agent in creation and the mediator in redemption are 'the Alpha and Omega' in the same Person; and there is one Father over all. The author now leaves the name 'Logos' and retains, throughout, the name 'Son'.

In this Gospel Jesus speaks of 'My Father' over thirty times, and of 'the Father' more than sixty times. He talks to a woman of Samaria—a woman of more than questionable reputation—of the Father. He says that 'the real worshippers', irrespective of place, 'will worship the *Father* in spirit and in reality; for these are the worshippers the *Father* wants'.¹⁷ At the grave of Lazarus He addresses His prayer, 'Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me'.¹⁸ And again in His 'high priestly' prayer He uses the same address, 'Father, the hour is come', etc.¹⁹ He speaks of the universe as 'my Father's house' of 'many mansions'²⁰ or dwelling-places (of which this earth is one). This dwelling was prepared before the children were born into it; now He 'goes to prepare' another, but it will be still 'in the Father's house'.

The witness of the Fourth Gospel may be summed up in the great word of Jesus, in reply to Philip's quest, 'Lord show us the Father and it sufficeth us': 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father'.²¹

Another interpreter, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, opens with these words: 'God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets, by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us *in a Son*, whom He appointed *heir of all things*, through whom also He made the worlds'.²² These words give essentially the same interpretation as that we have found in the prologue of the Fourth Gospel. The whole of the first chapter, and in fact most of the Epistle, describes *the majesty and glory of the Son*. How Dr Rheinold Niebuhr can bring himself to say, 'In the first chapter of Hebrews the consistent emphasis is upon the brevity and dependence of all temporal existence in contrast with the majesty and eternity of God', it is difficult to imagine. As if such a contrast were necessary! The 'majesty and eternity of God' have never been in question among the Hebrews; it is the majesty and eternity of *the Son* that they are here called to recognize. But in the whole of two volumes²³ on what would seem to be so relevant a

subject Dr Niebuhr has little to say of the Father or the Son, of whom the New Testament is so full. In common with most theologians of the Reformed traditions, he misses this New Testament emphasis.

The Son is first shown to be superior to the angels because He *is* a Son, and because He is divine.²⁴

Being addressed to the Hebrews, it is natural that the Epistle should make large reference to the Old Testament, and especially in terms of priesthood. Jesus is compared with Moses, as being 'counted worthy of more glory than Moses by so much as *he that built the house*, hath more honour than the house'.²⁵ And while Moses 'was faithful in all his (God's) house as a servant . . . Christ as a son over his own house'. Another comparison is with 'Melchizedek, king of Salem, priest of God Most High'.²⁶ This great figure of the priest-king of Salem, being without 'beginning of days or end of life', is declared to be 'made like unto *the Son of God*'. And as Melchizedek *anticipates* the Levitical priesthood, Jesus, going back to 'the order of Melchizedek', *annuls* the Levitical order. It is '*a Son perfected for evermore*' who is 'appointed' the true 'high priest' of our sinful humanity, and who 'is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near to God through Him'. Sonship is supreme. The whole treatise on priesthood is based upon it. It is from the Sonship that the Priesthood derived its abiding value. God is 'the Father of spirits', and receives as sons those who come to Him through the Son, and these the Father disciplines for their good.²⁷

According to this witness, God's last word is 'spoken to us in a *Son*', who relates us to God as Father, and to mankind as a family.

Our final New Testament interpreter—though earliest in time—is St Paul. For him there is no limit to the Fatherhood of God.

We find him including under God's Fatherhood the complete pagan, who never heard a word of the Christian message. Addressing an audience of philosophers in the Areopagus at Athens, he quotes with approval the Stoic poet's words, 'For we are also his offspring', and proceeds to reason with them how men, 'as the offspring of God' ought to think of and respond to Him.²⁸ Already he has declared to these same pagans that 'He is not far from any one of us; for in him we live and move and have our being'²⁹, also that God 'hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth'.³⁰ If God is not, in St Paul's view, the Father of all men, such words, addressed to such an audience, have no meaning.

In his letter to the Church in Colossae, he writes that the Son is 'the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature; for by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth . . . all things were created by him and for him: and he before all things, and in him all things consist'.³¹ Here we have the very note of the Fourth Gospel and of the opening words of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Lastly, we have the great affirmation of St Paul, that puts into definite statement all that has been suggested or implied in our study. Writing to the Ephesians, he says: 'There is . . . One God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all.'³² The Fatherhood of God is all inclusive.

Let us gather up the evidence. From the life and teaching of Jesus, from His own relation to, and revelation of the Father, from the response of simple

men as they first learned from Him to say, 'Our Father', from the insight of the New Testament seers as they interpret their Master and His story, and from their vision of a universe, including man, created and redeemed in and through a Son, we conclude that a world Family is integral to the Christian revelation, as it is correlative of the Fatherhood of God.

We further conclude that no 'middle wall of partition', no barriers of religious system, institution, church, sect, or party, and no division of class, nationality, or race can ultimately prevail against the vital unity of those nations 'whom God has made of one blood to dwell together', and whom, in a Son, He seeks to reconcile to Himself and to each other.

The innate and inherent unity of men and nations cries out, in the present agony, for effective expression and realization. Neither an amorphous internationalism, with its denial of nationhood, nor a mechanical amalgamation of states will meet the need for world unity. It calls for unity at the deepest level of human life—the unity of a Family of men whose Father is God. This vital unity is integral to the Christian revelation, and is waiting to find expression. 'God hath yet more light to shine forth from His word.' This is the light for this age, and this is the age that calls for its shining.

TOM DRING

¹ *The Fatherhood of God*, p.12.

² Luke 249 (Moffatt).

³ Matthew 322.

⁴ *ibid.* 59.

⁵ *ibid.* 516.

⁶ *ibid.* 548.

⁷ *ibid.* 628-30.

⁸ Romans 819-21.

⁹ Matthew 69-13.

¹⁰ *The Fatherhood of God, in loco.*

¹¹ Luke 2242.

¹² Matthew 2746.

¹³ Luke 2346.

¹⁴ John 11, 3, 14.

¹⁵ Acts 1417.

¹⁶ John 118.

¹⁷ *ibid.* 421-4.

¹⁸ *ibid.* 1141.

¹⁹ *ibid.* 171.

²⁰ *ibid.* 142.

²¹ *ibid.* 148-9.

²² Hebrews 11-2 (RV marg.).

²³ *The Nature and Destiny of Man.*

²⁴ Hebrews 16, 7, 8.

²⁵ *ibid.* 3, 6.

²⁶ *ibid.* 71, 3, 17, 18, 28.

²⁷ *ibid.* 126, 9, 10.

²⁸ Acts 1728.

²⁹ *ibid.* 1727.

³⁰ *ibid.* 1728.

³¹ Colossians 115-17.

³² Ephesians 46.

THE LANGUAGE OF FAITH

THE CHRISTIAN religion is remarkably tied to words; a historical revelation of God bequeathes us a historical record, and all the power of our linguistic and literary skill is turned upon that record. Our beliefs are hewn out of words to form unchanging creeds. Our theology is a vast analytical laboratory for words. The gospel is translated from language to language around the world, and the struggle goes on to clothe in new sounds the eternal meaning; the faith is carried along by words. Or so it seems.

But we may sometimes reflect in these self-conscious days how fragile this connexion of words and meanings really is. How easily the meaning of a word becomes obscure. How often people say, 'We must translate our fundamental religious terms—sin, salvation, faith, grace, love—into words that today's world

can understand. These words have grown strange to the world; they must be given living meaning again.' Here it seems that the continuation of our witness depends on the rejuvenation or the reinterpretation of our language.

When the modern unbelieving semantic philosophers, ruthlessly dissecting our religious phrases, pigeon-hole among their newly-discovered logical absurdities the Christian's belief that 'God is love', the Christian tries desperately to answer for himself the question, 'What does this phrase *mean*?' And sometimes he demands that the Church shall expound its rather technical vocabulary—of sin and divine grace and faith and holiness—as forcefully and unambiguously as the Communist Party expounds its equally elaborate vocabulary: capital, bourgeois, proletarian, class-war, dialectical materialism.

But we soon discover, as Alice did in her encounter with Humpty-Dumpty, what elusive creatures words can be. I do not believe that we can treat the words of our religious language as part of a technical vocabulary in which each word is defined unambiguously and on experimental or logical grounds. If we treat our religious language in this way we shall murder it—and no doubt this murder is committed from time to time.

The philosopher R. G. Collingwood once wrote of meaning 'hovering round a word' as a sea-gull hovers round a buoy. One may wish for the sake of neatness and precision to shoot the sea-gull and fix its position firmly on the buoy, but the effect is thereby marred. If a word is defined scientifically, then its meaning is drastically limited: all its surrounding shades of significance are eliminated, and it becomes an exclusive thing whose uses are disciplined and controlled. This does not imply that the non-technical use of words is undisciplined; there are other disciplines than that of science—there is that, for example, of which T. S. Eliot speaks¹ when he describes his task as a poet. The limitation of meaning practised in the definition of scientific terms would be disastrous in poetry, and can be disastrous elsewhere—especially in the language of our faith.

A physicist will rebuke you for using indiscriminately the word 'heat' when you should use the word 'temperature'—as though he had established a monopoly in the meaning of the word. An educational psychologist will, with commendable scientific-mindedness, define 'intelligence' in a strictly empirical way, as that which is measured by the process he calls an intelligence test. By this definition he limits the meaning of the word. Perhaps for his purposes that is necessary. But he frequently tries to convince others that if they do not accept his *limited* meaning, they are at fault in their judgement of intelligence, when in fact there is merely a disagreement over the use of a word.

It is this error that we must try to avoid in our exposition of the Bible and our theology. I believe that if we are to allow the Holy Spirit to interpret to us in this age the eternal Word, then we must take due heed of the modern consciousness of the elusive meaning of words. It is not surprising that in a time when the propagated word is such a terrible weapon for good or evil, the essential character of the verbal ammunition should come under new and close scrutiny. Recently, a writer,² reflecting on the perfect communication across language barriers that scientists found among themselves at an international scientific conference, exclaimed wistfully, '... if only "free elections"

could have as precise a meaning as "free electrons"! This is a beautiful expression of the present-day power of words, and the problem of their meaning.

All language lies between two extremes—the extreme of the scientific and the extreme of the poetic or imaginative. The scientific or technical vocabulary contains words that are either closely related to experiment or logically defined. No ambiguity is allowable, and the understanding between scientists on their own subject is therefore usually immediate and clear. On the other hand, words of imaginative language, as of poetry, are not thus limited and rigidly defined. Each word may have a whole spectrum of meaning, an aura of suggestion; two words placed side by side may light each other up with a new glow of meaning.

Now our ordinary language lies between these two extremes, mingling the rational with the imaginative; just as we bring both imagination and reason to bear on all the experience of life. The language of religion tends more to the imaginative than to the scientific, because religion is not a mere rational function, but an imaginative response of the whole person. But we are often in danger of attempting to use religious language as if it were a scientific vocabulary; we are tempted to explain 'grace' as a scientist might explain 'electrolysis'.

If for example we try to define the word 'salvation' in a rigid way we shall be defying the scriptural usages,¹ which are not one, but many, and express not one limited idea but a poetic image, not a rational definition but an intuitive meaning. To limit the use of a word is to attempt to limit religious experience. The language of our faith, therefore, being more of poetry than of science, must be studied in an imaginative way. Biblical criticism may be a science, but theology is not. Like poetic criticism, theology cannot succeed unless it is undertaken from an imaginative viewpoint.

This truth has always been understood when men have regarded the devotional language of the Church as more fundamental than its credal or polemical language. 'The language of prayer and worship . . . was the raw material out of which were laboriously hammered the credal definitions of Nicaea and Chalcedon.'² An illuminating comparison is of the words of Jesus—'The Kingdom of God has come'—with the declaration of Martin Luther—'Justification by faith alone'. The first is difficult to expound. For the 'Kingdom of God' can be comprehended at different levels; it has several meanings rolled into one; it is a poetic image. The second, however, has come to have a technical meaning. It is comparable with a phrase like 'the dictatorship of the proletariat'; its meaning has become restricted. If it replaces older poetic phrases as a test of orthodoxy, religious experience becomes narrowed and possibly distorted.

M. R. LANE

¹ *Four Quartets*, especially in passages towards the end of 'Burnt Norton' and 'East Coker'.

² Herbert Eisner, *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, 9th September 1954, p.7.

³ See, for example, *Theological Word Book of the Bible*.

⁴ G. W. H. Lampe, *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, July 1954, p.208.

The late C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

OUR READERS will have learned with deep regret that Dr C. Ryder Smith died on 23rd March, 1956. Dr Ryder Smith was not only a great man, but a great scholar and teacher, and kept abreast of modern thought right up to the end of his life in a quite astonishing way. *The London Quarterly & Holborn Review* has been very much indebted to him for his work as Review Editor, an office which he filled with distinction from 1943, and it is sad to know that the reviews which follow are the last that can appear under his name.

An appreciation of Dr Ryder Smith, both as man and scholar, will appear in our October number, together with an assessment of his work as author. *The Bible Doctrine of Grace, and Related Doctrines*, his latest book, has just been published, and the typescript of the final volume in his 'Bible Doctrine' series, *The Bible Doctrine of the Hereafter*, was fortunately in the hands of his publishers just before he died.

Recent Literature

EDITED BY C. RYDER SMITH

Christianity According to the Wesleys, by Franz Hildebrandt. (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

Dr Hildebrandt looks at Methodism appreciatively as one who has come fully into it from outside. He suggests that the true place of John Wesley's theology as mediatorial between Luther and Calvin, Anglicanism and Nonconformity, and the tradition of the German Church and Western Christendom, has yet to be assessed, as has also the commentary value of Charles Wesley's Hymns on Select Passages of the Holy Scriptures. These four lectures, delivered at Garrett, Evanston, treat Christianity as Biblical, Practical, Missionary, and Catholic. Wesley is shown as *homo unius libri*, being content to be taken to task by Moore, his biographer, for departing from Scripture in his sermon on the Ministerial Office. Wesley's *Notes on the New Testament* are commended, and a healthy reminder is given that 'None can be a good Divine who is not a good textuary'. "'Fullness" is the hall-mark of Wesley's Scriptural Christianity'. Dr Hildebrandt points out that the practical meaning of Methodism is focused on the 'person' of Methodists. They are distinct from formal, nominal, ornamental, and conventional Christians. Recurrent misconceptions of Methodism are discussed, and it is pointed out that 'Conversation on the Work of God' implies telling what God has done. Missionary Christianity is Scriptural, spreading from one to another. Wesley was not the least troubled by the present-day obsession with the problem of communication. Charles Wesley's hymns were a great means of communicating the faith. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is intended to be used frequently and can

be converting ordinance. True Methodism is Catholic, concerned with making Scriptural Christians. Modern Methodism is in danger of 'loss of substance' as nineteenth-century Methodism lost 'form' in its slide into Nonconformity. Dr Hildebrandt fears lest the acceptance of Dr Fisher's proposals should reduce Methodism once more to the status of a society with a predominantly pietistic emphasis and make us lose the substance of our churchmanship. This is a stimulating book and a timely reminder of Methodism's 'first things'.

J. KINGSLEY SANDERS

How to Pray, by Jean-Nicholas Grou; translated by J. Dalby. (James Clarke, 7s. 6d.)

These chapters on prayer from Père Grou's *The School of Jesus Christ* were first published as a separate book in 1898, but the translation has been freshly done from the French edition of Father Doyotte. They say a great many of the elementary things about prayer which every Christian teacher would wish to emphasize. There are wise words, for example, about the importance of adoration and thanksgiving, about attention, and about the relationship between prayer and daily life; and there is a sound exposition of the Lord's Prayer. Yet the book as a whole is disappointing. There is no freshness of vision or vividness of imagination to grip the reader's mind. Only those who have not very often thought about prayer will learn much from it, and yet it can hardly be recommended to beginners. That is not because it assumes Roman doctrine and practice, nor because it bears the marks of an authoritarian age in which the master of the household exacted unquestioning obedience from servants and children, though both these facts limit its usefulness. It is because its teaching often seems unnatural and even untrue. The author would have us believe that when we pray we ought to be indifferent to the success of our requests, that in fully Christian prayer there is never any agitation or unquietness (surely he has forgotten Gethsemane and Calvary!), that life is 'a long and wearisome captivity', that everything within and without us is opposed to God, and that we must always live in fear of offending God, because He is quite likely to send us to Hell without giving us a chance to repent. It ought to be added that Evelyn Underhill considered these chapters to be one of the best short expositions of the essence of prayer that had ever been written, and the present reviewer is conscious that there must, therefore, be much more value in them than he has been able to find. But he is not in doubt that Père Grou was deceiving himself when he claimed that God so completely guided his pen that he wrote nothing of himself.

J. ALAN KAY

Sex Problems and Personal Relationships, by E. Parkinson Smith and A. Graham Ikin. (Heinemann, 10s.)

There is no shortage of sex information in these days, but this is not enough. What we need is a philosophy of sex, integrating sexual activities within the whole context of life, and this book, in its 145 pages, makes a worthwhile contribution to that end. There are chapters on Christianity and sex, sex and friendship, marriage and parenthood, critical periods in courtship and marriage, homosexuality, and cultural values. Although the size of the book limits the range of discussion, the authors, a man and a woman, have 'done a good job'. The book is in two parts, the first dealing with the problems of the older adolescent, and the second with those of more mature persons. The chapter on 'mixed' marriages consists of a letter from a Protestant who wishes to marry a Roman Catholic, and the authors' reply. It is obviously not a complete examination of all the problems involved, but it contains useful advice. One could wish for more, as also on the question of homosexuality, but, it is typical of the book that one is always asking for more. Its aim is to place sex problems in their real setting, and it succeeds to a large extent. It will be of value to all social workers as well as to people either married or about to be, but there is need for care before

introducing younger people to problems which they will not face until much later experience. Some of the chapters, such as those on courtship and on critical periods in marriage, would be very useful as pamphlets. The book is much more than a bare answer to sex difficulties. It sees the hope of the world, in this atomic age, as depending on how people can achieve wholeness of living.

HERBERT MILLS

Preaching the Gospel from the Gospels, by G. R. Beasley-Murray. (Lutterworth, 8s. 6d.)

New Testament Christianity, by J. B. Phillips. (Hodder & Stoughton, 10s. 6d.)

Dr Beasley-Murray has proved himself a scholar of fine quality by his studies of Mark 13 in the work called *Jesus and the Future* and of the Resurrection in *Christ is Alive*, and it is not surprising that the Associations of Congregational and Baptist lay preachers in London asked him to address them on the theme of his new book. He is a lucid and attractive guide, whose soundly-based conservative scholarship will commend itself to Methodist preachers, both ordained and lay. He has not attempted to provide material for ready conversion into sermons, but, what is far better, asks his readers to think clearly and attentively about great sections of the Gospels and to discern at every point the fundamental evangelical message. In the opening chapter he justifies his approach by using the form-critical method to demonstrate that from the very beginning the Gospels were firmly linked to the work of the first preachers. Then he expounds the gospel in the life of Jesus (the infancy, ministry, Passion, and Resurrection), in His miracles, His teaching, and His parables. For example, Chapter 3 begins by stating and carefully examining four reasons for confidence in the Gospel record of the miracles; and then shows that miracles do more than display Jesus' sympathy with sick people—they are 'of a piece with His message and in some sense declarative of it'. In this theological meaning they testify to Jesus as Lord and Saviour, as the master of evil powers and Lord of creation, as the revealer of God and the bestower of life. Although this is not a beginner's book, every preacher would do well to read it as early as possible in his ministry.

Mr Phillips, having spent fourteen years in close contact with the Greek of the New Testament while preparing his deservedly popular translations, now makes the comment: 'It is the sheer spiritual zest and drive which fill one with both wonder and wistfulness.' In this book he wants to help his readers to recapture the authentic 'feel' of the primitive Christian experience in modern terms. It is a further task of 'translation', and the author brings to it the gifts of a very good pastor. There are chapters on faith, hope, love, and peace—what they mean and how to practise them. The reader may occasionally wince at highly-coloured, romantic language, or may feel that the writer has not kept 'faith' (for example) exactly in focus, yet he cannot fail to acknowledge gratefully a book in which so much enthusiasm is combined with so much good sense. Would that other students of the Greek New Testament . . .

KENNETH GRAYSTON

The Sacrifice of Christ, by C. F. D. Moule. (Hodder & Stoughton, 6s. and 3s. 6d.)

This little book had its origin in four lectures given to ordinands at Cuddesdon College, and concerns the relationship between God's finished work of salvation and His continuing work, between Christ and the Church, and between the sacrifice on Calvary and the sacrifice in the Eucharist. It is written with scholarship, insight, devotion, charity, and modesty. Professor Moule suggests some sound principles of interpretation, raises some stimulating points of biblical exegesis, asks some very pertinent questions (as, for example, about the relationship between baptism and the Eucharist), and brings together both the Evangelical and Catholic approaches to his subject.

J. ALAN KAY

Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, by Martin Dibelius. (S.C.M., 25s.)

During the later years of his life, Dr Dibelius, Professor at the University of Heidelberg, concerned himself increasingly with the literary study of the acts of the Apostles, but unhappily he died before he was able to incorporate the results of these investigations into a book; only a number of separate articles had been written. In 1951, however, these were collected into book form and published, and it is that collection of articles which has now been made available to English readers in this translation by Mary Ling and Paul Schubert. As is only to be expected, there is a measure of overlapping and repetition in the different essays. The same ground is sometimes traversed more than once, the same arguments outlined, and the same conclusions defended. All readers would have preferred, had it been possible, a more integrated presentation of Dr Dibelius's subject. In the circumstances, however, we are most grateful to have these valuable studies collected and made available to us. The author gives close attention to the literary analysis of the Acts. He believes that the same author wrote both Acts and the Third Gospel, and that the author was Luke. He draws a sharp contrast, however, between the differences of method Luke was compelled to use in compiling Acts and the Gospel. He believes that the method of form criticism can most satisfactorily explain the origin of the Gospel. This is not true of Acts, however, for there were no similar oral materials available to the author for the composition of Acts. He argues that the basic source behind the second part of Acts is what he calls an 'itinerary'. By this he means a brief record, noting the towns where Paul stayed, his hosts in those towns (in case he wished to claim their good offices again), and the results of his work there. The 'we-sections' are regarded as an integral part of this itinerary, the pronoun being adjusted to indicate Luke's presence. Into this framework Luke has inserted two different types of material: (a) narratives of incidents, which he has collected, and (b) speeches, which he has placed on the lips of the chief characters. Indeed, after the literary analysis, it is the speeches which engage Dr Dibelius's attention most. He notes that there are twenty-four of these in Acts, and believes that none of them is authentic, but that all are literary compositions by Luke. They are not meant to be attempts to say what might have been said on a particular occasion, but rather a particular occasion is used as the setting for the kind of sermon which Luke thought Christian preachers should preach to certain audiences. 'They are intended not for the audiences who actually heard them, but for the readers.' Chapter IX considers these speeches in relation to similar speeches in ancient historiography, and Chapter II is devoted to a detailed study of Paul's speech at Athens. Pages 186-91 contain a most interesting investigation of the 'Literary Allusions in the Speeches of Acts'. A third discussion which will be noted with interest is that (in Chapter IV) of the so-called 'Western Text' of Acts. He emphatically declares it to be less original than the Egyptian text. This is mainly on the ground that the 'seams' by which the narratives and speeches have been attached to the 'itinerary' have in the Western Text been more neatly disguised, as though by a process of revision. He concludes: 'The Western Text has no claim to be considered an original text.' If these three topics are the main features of this book, they are by no means the only ones of interest and importance. Every student of Acts will be grateful to have these significant studies made available, and to become acquainted with the discerning and weighty conclusions of the author.

C. L. MITTON

Selected Letters of John Wesley, edited by Frederick C. Gill. (Epworth Press, 15s.)

The general student seeking an intimate portrait of John Wesley and his mission, as revealed by his correspondence, is likely to be put off by the fact that the Standard Edition of that correspondence contains 2,670 letters and runs to eight large volumes.

The task of skimming the cream off this collection was therefore well worth doing, and Mr Gill has performed the task with distinction. He has amply achieved his aim of presenting 'a cross-section of the correspondence, keeping as far as possible to what is personal and vital, yet preserving a fair representation and balance of the whole'. In this volume we have 275 of the letters (the longer ones usually abbreviated), covering every period of Wesley's life and a wide range of subjects and correspondents. With such riches to choose from, the choice might have been made *differently* in a hundred ways, but one feels that it could not have been done *better*. In a work of this kind a few errors were perhaps inevitable, but they are indeed few: on a number of occasions the points denoting omissions have been overlooked: Letter 18 is wrongly dated 3rd October 1731, instead of 17th November; and Letter 61 is both incorrectly dated and ascribed to the wrong recipient. Mr Gill has made no attempt to go outside the Standard Edition for the letters chosen or for their text, and little attempt to do so in his admirable introductions to the various letters. Arduous collation with originals would probably have led to the correction of a few minor errors, such as the note to Letter 157, which says that 'Mr Sparrow was a Sheffield acquaintance', whereas in actual fact the letter was addressed 'To Mr Sparrow in James' Street, Westminster'. These, however, are minor points, and obviously such minutiae affect the research student rather than the general reader, for whom this selection has been prepared. In his main task, Mr Gill has succeeded magnificently, and has provided us in one compact and tastefully produced volume with the 'characteristic tang' and the distilled essence of one of the greatest accumulations of correspondence in the English language.

FRANK BAKER

Christ's Standard Bearer: A Study in the Hymns of Charles Wesley, by George H. Findlay. (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

Mr Findlay is one of those who recognize that it is inevitable and indeed desirable that the contents of a hymn-book should change with the changing generations. Yet he insists strongly that 'there is no better introduction to Methodist theology than the Wesley hymns in the 1876 book . . . the last of the series of hymn-books begun by John Wesley himself.' In a series of nine brief studies, he enables us to appreciate both Charles Wesley's mastery of verse technique and the way in which that mastery was inseparably welded to a deep evangelical experience, so that he was able to forge some of the sharpest weapons ever wielded by the Soldiers of Christ. Mr Findlay takes the 1876 *Collection* as his textbook throughout, even though he refers to the 1780 *Collection* (he calls it '1779 hymn-book', from the date of its Preface) and furnishes a useful index to the eighty-two hymns illustrated from the current (1933) hymn-book. The opening studies deal with the form and structure of the hymns. The chapter called 'The Two Brothers' demonstrates the reactions of John and Charles Wesley upon each other by reference to the 'perverse' 6 6.7.7.7.7 metre. The following three are sufficiently described by their titles—'Exclamation Marks', 'Wesley's Use of Metre', and 'Patterns of Words'. The second part of the book provides a stimulating introduction to the basic message of the hymns, under the titles: 'Two Verbs: Feel and Prove', 'An Important Noun: Nature', 'Perfect Love', 'The Good Fight of Faith', and 'Heaven'. Mr Findlay is in the tradition of both Bernard Manning and J. E. Rattenbury, yet he is quite independent in his thought and research. He enables us to get inside the mind and heart of Charles Wesley, and lights up many a point both of prosody and theology with keen insight and the striking phrase. Unpretentious though this volume is, a mere seventy-five small pages, it not only provides fascinating material for the general reader, but a stimulus for the keenest student of the Wesleys.

FRANK BAKER

Christian Focus, by A. R. Wallace. (Hodder & Stoughton, 10s. 6d.)

In a compact volume of 160 pages, the Dean of Exeter has attempted to sketch a Christian philosophy of life and to bring human affairs under the focus of Christian judgement. From a significant word in the Preface, one conceives that the book embodies a series of lectures to the local branch of the Workers' Educational Association who prompted publication. If that be so, one is glad that such an audience listened to such an exposition of a Christian attitude to life. One says 'a' Christian attitude and not 'the' advisedly, because the approach is unmistakably from an Anglo-Catholic point of view. This peeps through in many places, but most unmistakably, as would be expected, in the chapter on the Church, with its account of Christian prayer almost modelled on a monastic discipline. Thus while the nature of the conjectural audience gives a slant to the form the chapters take, the contents are determined by a particular school of Anglican theology. Not that the book is the worse for that; it is simply that this is the standpoint from which the book is written. If it were written from another point of view—say, Lutheran or Calvinist—it would be a different book, but still Christian. Its supreme merit is that it makes God as revealed in our Lord Jesus Christ relevant for the whole of life. This is apparent from the three opening chapters on Economics, History, and Politics and War, where the antithesis is repeatedly drawn between the theistic and Christian approach to life and that of the secularistic philosophies of our time. 'The ultimate truth, divinely revealed through the life and death of the Carpenter of Nazareth, about Nature, Man, and God'—that sets the trail through the book for an examination of 'some of the most prominent and influential human activities: Economics, Politics, Administration of Justice, Sex, Marriage and the Home, Medicine and Psychology, Education, International Relationships, Art, Athletics and Recreation'. One wonders what impression the lectures, if such they were, made on their hearers, and what impression they will make on readers of the book. One reader, at least, after a second perusal, with years of teaching on the same issues behind him, confesses to a shade of disappointment. The categorical language in which the book is written does not seem to recognize the questionings of faith which so pervade the modern mind. There is almost a 'take it or leave it' attitude, somewhat aloof from the rough and tumble of human affairs where the relevance of faith in God has to be tested, as though the author were speaking from some Olympic height above the storm in the valley below. Much competent knowledge appears of the facts of the human situation, but not much evidence of being in the thick of it. Thus the book seems a trifle chilling and didactic, but not compelling, convincing, or possessing a sense of urgency. Perhaps the reason is to be found in a quotation in the opening sentence of the author's Preface: 'It was the late Cardinal Rampolla who said, "Never deny. Never explain. Never apologize."' There speaks the Catholic theologian.

E. C. URWIN

The Self and the Dramas of History, by Reinhold Niebuhr. (Faber, 21s.)

In this book Niebuhr treats in greater detail some of the subjects raised in his earlier studies. It is the same Niebuhr who speaks, with the same erudition, the same mastery of his materials, the same penetrating insights, the same encouragement to hope, and the same warning not to hope for too much from human history. He begins with a critical analysis of the self, first with special reference to its internal dialogues, and then to its external relations. He upholds the biblical realism, and is particularly critical of naturalistic, rationalistic, and mystical views, which, he maintains, fail to recognize the profundities of individuality, especially with regard to immortality, or, as he would prefer to say, resurrection. The Bible asserts the discontinuity between the self and God. God is other, but not wholly other. The gulf is crossed by faith responding to the divine initiative. The second part is devoted to

an analysis of the Hebrew and Hellenic conceptions of the self and history. The latter is built on the search for order, and is thus the forerunner of the modern scientific outlook, but this approach leads to salient factors of individuality being overlooked or modified. The former acknowledges freedom and responsibility, and recognizes the factor of transcendence. Niebuhr, like Berdyaev, stakes his life on freedom, and warns against the common practice of identifying the self with the mind. Here the statements of several deterministic psychologists and sociologists are examined and found wanting. Techniques which are wholly appropriate for the study of nature may be inadequate and inappropriate when applied to the study of human nature. Part Three deals with the individual and society, and the tensions which arise between them. The command to obey the State authorities cannot apply when the State commands what is contrary to the declared will of God, yet the conscience of the individual is far from infallible. Niebuhr holds that the society most likely to endure is that which is best able to work out a compromise between the interests and convictions of individuals and those of the majority. In this respect he is very critical of Russian Communism, because any deliverance of an individual conscience which does not harmonize with the party line is regarded as treachery. Communism cannot survive as it is, because it cannot do justice to the complex interests and characteristics of the countries it has absorbed. England is held up as the example of common-sense compromise. The rights and limits of property-holding are considered, and also the place of authority within societies as well as within society. Finally, attention is given to the problem of world community and life after death. The fact of transcendence reveals that man is meant to live, and indicates that he is not essentially of the transitory nature of the world in which he now exists. However ill Niebuhr may have been when writing this book, there is no sign of any weakening in his grasp of his chosen themes.

PERCY SCOTT

The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology. Studies in Honour of C. H. Dodd, edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube. (C.U.P., 70s.)

This is a weighty volume in more senses than one; it weighs nearly three pounds! It contains twenty-six essays written in honour of C. H. Dodd by scholars of international reputation—Bultmann, Goguel, T. W. Manson, E. Schweizer, etc. Most of them are in English, but there are five in German and four in French. British Methodism is worthily represented by C. K. Barrett. One of the editors is a Jew; one of the writers is a Roman Catholic; and more than half a dozen countries are presented. It is a matter for rejoicing that a great scholar and prophet, to whom we all owe so much, has been honoured in this way. The first half of this fascinating book is concerned with the Background of the New Testament, and the second part with New Testament Eschatology. Several essays deal in various ways with the problem of relating the eschatological viewpoint with the practical questions of 'life in the flesh' and the course of history. Thus A. N. Wilder searches for a Biblical basis of social action. He finds this in the Pauline teaching on demonic cosmic powers which through Christ are coming to nought. Viewed in this way, eschatology should not lead to individual pietism, but can provide justification for a social Gospel, since the 'world-rulers' include the structural elements of unregenerate society. Again, N. A. Dahl, in an interesting essay on Christ, Creation, and the Church, shows that eschatology is often presented in the New Testament in terms of a new creation which has already begun to take place, and that this involves not only a contrast between the Church and 'this world' but also a positive attitude to all that God has made, the divine purpose being to restore and reconcile all things. As one would expect, the Dead Sea Scrolls are in evidence, and although there is no essay directly on them, the stimulus and interest they have aroused are reflected in M. Black's account of the Essenes in

Hippolytus and Josephus, and in H. J. Schoeps's essay on Ebionitism. They also figure in a valuable essay by W. F. Albright on 'Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St John', and in a well-annotated discussion by E. Schweizer of the presence of the Spirit as an eschatological sign. J. Héring writes on Biblical eschatology and Platonic idealism, with special reference to Philo, Hebrews, and Origen. It is interesting to compare his treatment of Hebrews with that of C. K. Barrett, who in dealing with the Epistle's eschatology contends that certain features which are usually thought to derive from Alexandrian Platonism actually come from apocalyptic symbolism. E. Stauffer writes on 'Agnostos Christos', and among other things he challenges the view that the apocalyptic sayings of the Synoptics are the most reliable. He holds that the Fourth Gospel goes back to the original standpoint of Jesus Himself, ignoring or correcting the popular apocalyptic which came into the community and the Gospel tradition after the events of Easter. It is curious that in one passage, Stauffer speaks three times of Daniel when the references show that he means Ezra. There is an able survey of Septuagintal studies by P. Katz. The book is excellently produced and printed. I have noticed only five or six misprints, all of a trivial nature, e.g. *poterti* for *poterit* on p. 288.

T. FRANCIS GLASSON

From My New Shelf

BY C. RYDER SMITH

History of the Moravian Church, by Edward Langton (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.). This short history is very welcome, not least to Methodists, for it gives the background of the story of 'Wesley and the Moravians'. For instance, it shows that the Moravians who sailed to Georgia on the same boat as Wesley and his three companions were not mere immigrants, but a missionary group. It was the way of the Moravians to evangelize by groups. Again, Dr Langton shows how it was possible for the Wesleys to belong to the society that met in Fetter Lane without being Moravians, for the latter set themselves to join with others in *any* evangelical enterprise. It was for this reason that Ingham and Cennick, pursuing their independent campaigns in Yorkshire and Wiltshire and beyond, were able to appeal to the Moravians to take charge of their work. It is well known how greatly Wesley's visit to Herrnhut influenced him, but he had criticisms to make. For instance, he asked whether the Moravians were not 'of a close, dark, reserved temper and behaviour'. Dr Langton, of course, makes it clear that the Quietism over which Wesley left the Fetter Lane society was not a Moravian doctrine, but a temporary phase under the influence of

Molther. But there is much of great interest apart from the subject 'The Moravians and the Methodists'. The *Unitas Fratrum* owed much to scholars and 'nobles'. Here the names of Comenius and Zinzendorf are only the greatest of many. Again, it is remarkable how careful the *Unitas* was to preserve the episcopal succession—from the Apostles, as they thought, through the Waldenses—yet, at least at one time, allowed elders to ordain occasionally, even by letter. Again, the scattered 'Congregations' were reluctant to admit new members, for, as Zinzendorf put it, their purpose was to 'unite *all the children of God*' of whatever Church. He himself was both a Lutheran 'elder' and a Moravian 'bishop'. This reluctance to 'proselytize', along with the strict ordering of life within each group, was perhaps the chief reason why the Moravians, unlike the Methodists and Salvationists, did not speedily multiply. They were very slow to call themselves a 'Church' and then, Zinzendorf's paradoxical phrase, it was as 'a church within a church'. As to creed, the Brethren set out to be like the first Christians, and, while they too were ready to die for their faith, like them they did not soon gather their beliefs into a formal and comprehensive creed. Indeed, from the time when Luther arose, they have always been irenic and anxious to emphasize their agreement with Protestants rather than any differences. They have used the lot when decision has been difficult. There has never, of course, been as missionary a Church as theirs, and today there are what might be called Moravian 'pockets' in areas scattered from Alaska to the Himalayas and Nyasa. Dr Langton has gathered his material very carefully, giving his authorities under every point, and has packed much into small space. I have noticed two slips: on p. 13 the words 'by the laity' are to be added to the phrase 'abolished the use of the cup', and on p. 165 'supreme legislative' powers seem to be ascribed both to the General Synod and certain Provincial Synods. There are six good portraits. For the heroic age, when the first 'congregation' of fugitives at last gathered out of the long and confused turmoils that followed the burning of Huss, I can only refer readers to Dr Langton. Charles Wesley has epitomized the story:

*Through much distress and pain
Through many a conflict here,
Through blood ye must the entrance gain.*

The Lord's Horseman: John Wesley the Man, by Umphrey Lee (Hodder & Stoughton, 12s. 6d.). This book, published a number of years ago in the United States, is now issued in England. It is a very interesting book. Dr Lee has a keen eye for the vivid anecdote and the effective quotation (though he does not always give references). He likes a story that provokes a smile—not least if the smile is at Wesley. There are a few small mistakes, e.g. England was not a 'nation of shopkeepers' when Wesley was born, and to 'possess forty shillings a year' did not give a man a vote; but Dr Lee is generally accurate. 'The eccentric poet', however, does not seem to me a happy name for Charles Wesley, and Dr Lee's comment on the famous entry about 'merit' in the *Minutes* of 1770 is, I think, quite misleading. But the *perspective* of the book is wrong. There is much about Wesley's 'love affairs' and not a little about *Primitive Physic*, but the *Appeals* and the *Sermons* are dismissed with a sentence or two. The *Sermons*, no doubt, seem dry to many now, but surely there ought to have been some account of the chief items in Wesley's 'gospel'. Instead, apart from the controversy against predestination, there is little more than passing reference. To quote the title of the book, 'the man' *was* the message. One is not surprised that an American writer should give large space to Wesley's attitude to the American Revolution, but ought there not to be *something* about his advocacy of 'holiness'? Dr Lee has given us a very able and interesting book *about* Wesley, but the portrait is 'out of focus'. There is no index.

William Blake: The Finger on the Furnace, by Laura DeWitt James (Vantage Press, New York, \$2.75). This book is an exposition of the teaching of Blake's three long Prophetic poems, *Vala*, *Milton*, and *Jerusalem*, with special reference to 'the doctrine of the False Tongue under Beulah'. Mrs James has tried, not unsuccessfully, 'to use only simple words and simple, clear sentences', but, of course, she has to admit that when Blake said, 'That which can be made Explicit to the Idiot is not worth my care', there was truth in the insolence. He cannot be made easy, but this book does help.

Heaven and Hell, a Present-Day Christian Interpretation, by John Sutherland Bonnell (Abingdon Press, via Epworth Bookshop, \$1.00). Dr Bonnell, Minister at 'Fifth Avenue', New York, is a famous 'radi-ist'—if that is the right term. When he asked his hearers what he was to speak about in Lent, seventy answers out of every hundred said, 'Immortality'—and here are his five addresses. It seems to me that, for their purpose, they are not far short of perfect. The subjects are: 'Is Death a Blind Alley or an Open Road?', 'A Modern Christian's Concept of Heaven', 'A Modern Christian's Concept of Hell', 'Is Recognition Possible after Death?', and 'The Resurrection of Christ'. (Dr Bonnell tells us that at 'Fifth Avenue', perhaps the most famous pulpit in America, no one had preached on 'Hell' for forty years.)

Mordecai the Jew, by Corona O. F. Thorns (Stockwell, Ilfracombe, 8s. 6d.). 'But Esther, bullied into helping the people of God, chose the reckless way with careless insolence.' This quotation is an example of the method of this book.

Method in Prayers: an Exposition and Exhortation, by W. Graham Scroggie (Pickering & Inglis, 6s.). A revised edition of a book published something like forty years ago. The chapters are entitled 'The Practice of Prayer', 'Adoration', 'Confession', 'Petition', 'Intercession', 'Thanksgiving', and 'the Study of Prayer' (as it occurs in the Bible).

A Companion to the Communion Service, by William Robinson (Berean Press, 5s.). A reprint of a very helpful 'devotional manual', first issued by the Oxford Press in 1942, with a commendation by Nathaniel Micklem.

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

The Expository Times, March (T. & T. Clark, 1s. 9d.)

Were Paul's Imprisonment Epistles written from Ephesus?, by G. S. Duncan.

Industrial Evangelism, by A. Skevington Wood.

Reflections on Bultmann's Hermeneutic, II (trans.), by H. Thielicke.

Christ's Challenge to Straight Thinking, by John Baker.

We note the publication of two new periodicals:

The Raven, a magazine for clergy and ministers on expository preaching, is published by the British Council of Churches, and may be obtained from its Publications Department at 10 Eaton Gate, S.W.1, price 4s. per annum, post free. The magazine is to appear six times a year. The first issue appeared in March. It is edited by the Rev. Dr Harold Roberts of Richmond College, assisted by a Board representing different Churches.

The Journal of Semitic Studies is a new quarterly, edited by Drs H. H. Rowley and P. R. Weis, and published by the Manchester University Press at 32s. per annum, post free, or 10s. 6d. a single issue. The first number appeared in January. As would be expected, special attention is paid to Hebrew and Jewish studies, but the word 'Semitic' is to be taken in its widest sense.

Our Contributors

- JOHN CROWLESMITH**
Methodist Minister. Secretary of the Methodist Church Spiritual Healing Committee since 1938; Secretary of the Methodist Society for Medical and Pastoral Psychology. Editor of *Spiritual Healing Booklets*. Vice-Chairman, National Marriage Guidance Council and Editor of *Marriage Guidance*. Hon. Director, Cambridge Marriage Guidance Council.
- ERASTUS EVANS**
M.A.
Graduate in Philosophy, Liverpool University; Theological Tripos (Cambridge); Burney and Hulsean Prizeman (Cambridge); Finch Scholar (Wesley House). Studied with Rudolf Otto at Marburg University. Chairman, Guild of Pastoral Psychology.
- P. H. W. GRUBB**
M.A.
Educated Wellington College and at St Peter's Hall, Oxford. From 1936-43 was an Assistant Curate at St Mary's, Portsea, and then Rector of Bedhampton near Portsmouth for ten years, before present appointment as Rector of Shillingstone in 1953.
- J. BURNETT RAE**
M.B., CH.B.
Vice-Chairman, Churches' Council of Healing; Hon. Cons. Physician, Croydon General Hospital. Previously in charge of the Department of Psychological Medicine.
- HENRY CHARLES ROBINS**
M.A.
Winchester College and New College, Oxford. Hon. Chaplain, Khartoum; Rural Dean, and Proctor in Convocation. Chaplain to the King. Vice-President of Guild of Healing. Author of *A Guide to Spiritual Healing*.
- E. S. WATERHOUSE**
M.A., D.D., D.LIT.
Professor of the Philosophy of Religion in the University of London, since 1938. Lecturer in Philosophy, Richmond College, 1920; Principal, 1940. Author of numerous works, including *Modern Theories of Religion*, *The Psychology of Religious Experience*, *The Philosophical Approach to Religion*.
- G. THOMPSON BRAKE**
Methodist Minister. Student of Education affairs. Represented the Methodist Church on Committees for preparation and adoption of Agreed Syllabus of Religious Instruction for schools in Norwich and Norfolk.
- FRANK CALLISTER**
M.A., B.D.
Methodist Minister. Chaplain to Sheffield University Methodist Society, 1951-4.
- A. G. CURNOW**
Methodist Minister (retired). Honorary Chaplain to the Forces. Paton Prizeman (Church History), 1948, and Langhorne-Orchard Prizeman (Philosophy), 1952.
- TOM DRING**
Methodist Minister. Reviewer and contributor to philosophical and theological publications.
- K. VAUGHAN JONES**
M.A., B.D.
Methodist Minister.
- MICHAEL R. LANE**
B.SC., D.PHIL.
Lay missionary; formerly a research student at Queen's College, Oxford. Now teaches chemistry at Bankura Christian College, West Bengal.
- C. RYDER SMITH**
B.A., D.D.
Principal, Richmond College, 1920-40. Professor in Theology, London University, 1932-40. President, Wesleyan Methodist Conference, 1931. Author of many theological books.
- CHARLES H. S. WARD**
Methodist Supernumerary Minister. Studied Buddhism under Dr A. S. Geden at Richmond College. Worked in the Buddhist areas of Ceylon for thirty-three years. Author of two books for the 'Great Religions of the East Series' *Buddhism* Vol. 1, *Hinayana*; *Buddhism* Vol. 2, *Mahayana*.

tual
sity
ing
ncil
dge

pen
ch
urg

om
em
ow

an,
rt-

in,
ain
A

an,
so;
ra
the

ed
p-
in

at

a.
rd

ad

e,
e,

y,
st

Or
as
ie
s;

-
y